1-1-1973

The historical roots of educational innovation.

John H. Alschuler
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

A Dissertation

By

John H. Alschuler, Jr.

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Major Subject: Education

May 1973

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

A Dissertation

By

John H. Alschuler, Jr.

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Rhody A. McCoy, Chairman of Committee

Dr. Dwight W. Allen, Dean, School of Education

Dr. Gloria I. Joseph

Dr. Ernest Washington

Dr. Michael H. Best

May 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would particularly like to acknowledge the assistance and devotion of Mrs. Betty Rubenstein, Mr. John Alschuler, Sr., Dr. Rhody A. McCoy and Ms. Diana Diamond. Each has in a very particular way, forced me to deal with the complexity of individuals, the necessity to continually struggle against the violence which characterizes our society, and the limits and potential of education.

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION
(May 1973)

John H. Alschuler, Jr., B. A., Wesleyan University

Directed by : Dr. Rhody A. McCoy

ABSTRACT

The dissertation attempts to create a theoretical model to explain the relationship between economic development and educational innovations, and then to substantiate that model with specific examples from the history of American education. The theoretical segment is comprised of five propositions:

A. Educational innovation is a secondary variable dependent upon economic structures of society, therefore its development is determined by the development of the economy.

B. Economic needs are translated into educational arguments by means of ideologies, i.e., the expression of self-interest in terms which imply general benefit.

C. The function of the government is to mask implementation of class interest in the mantle of public legitimacy.

D. Innovation develops in two spheres: reform in the structure of institutions, and reform in pedagogical styles.

E. Both structure and style reflect dominant economic characteristics because of direct control, and because of the pervasive influence of the means of production.

The second chapter attempts to describe in detail the manner in which schooling is used for the perpetuation of economic stratification. The purpose is to understand the effect of educational innovation on those particular actions of educators that relate to the social function of educational institutions. The chapter begins with a definition of the term socialization and then describes that process as it relates to schools. It is postulated that schools develop the ideological attitudes, affective characteristics, and intellectual modalities of students, and that the manner of instruction creates values and cognitive characteristics that can be related to the teacher's perception of the future economic role of his/her students. It is not argued that the teacher's intent is Machiavellian, only that the institution's definition of what is "beneficial" for any given student is based on an ideology which legitimatizes economic stratification.

These assertions about the function and mechanisms of educational institutions are then related to the process of innovation in two historical periods: 1820 to 1840 and 1910 to 1930. In each section the characteristics of society, such as alteration in the characteristics of the means of production or an increase in working-class militancy, is related to the specific demands of educational reformers. Each of these demands is examined to determine the relationship between this formulation and the class motives of its advocates. It is argued that regardless of the formulation of the demands, each masks an expectation of a specific outcome, such as an increased rate of growth in the

economy, or more sophisticated devices of social control. Each of these expectations is then related to the concrete innovations introduced during the period in question. These innovations are divided into two categories: structural, such as the introduction of bureaucratic forms of school organization in the 1830's; and pedagogical, such as the introduction of tracking under progressivism.

In the final segments, the dissertation discusses the social origins of contemporary innovations. Political and economic events, such as the mobilization of the Third World community and the increase in white, middle-class unrest is linked to the increased acceptability of the existence of an "educational crisis," and the various remedies proposed to solve this crisis.

Five specific attempts at reform are then analyzed: desegregation, model subsystems, parallel system, total system reform, and compensatory education. It is concluded that these attempts failed to effect any significant change either in education or in society. In fact, each reform served to perpetuate the retention of power in the educational bureaucracy, to maintain the political power of the ruling economic coalition, and ultimately hinders the development of real educational alterations. In summation, such innovations represent an alteration in the tactics of oppression rather than the alleviation of oppression itself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Finally, in regard to those who possess the largest shares in the stock of wordly goods, could there, in your opinion, be a police so vigilant and effective for the protection of all rights of persons, property and character, as such a sound, comprehensive education and training as our system of common schools could be made to impart; and would not the payment of a sufficient tax to make such education and training universal be the cheapest means of self-protection and insurance?

Horace Mann

Political dreamers! Reformers, if ye prefer that I shall call you so! Feed first the hungry; clothe firth the naked, or ill-clad; provide comfortable homes for all; by hewing down colossal estates among us and equalizing all property; take care that the animal wants be supplied first; that even the apprehension of want be banished; and then you will have a good field and good subjects for education. Then will instruction be conveyed without obstacle; for the wants, the unsatisfied wants of the body will not interfere with it.

Thomas Skidmore

PART I

EDUCATION AND THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY: A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

CHAPTER I

FIVE THEORETICAL PROPOSITIONS

Education is currently understood in an ahistorical context, almost as if it were separate from its relation to the characteristics of society. Educational change or innovation, like all alterations in a public service bureaucracy, is analyzed as if it were an isolated variable developing out of generic sources. Rather than examining the social and political context in which development occurs, historians seek the cause of change in the findings of researchers or philosophers. For example, the philosophic alterations advocated during the progressive era are attributed to the analytic genius of John Dewey, or the development of the open classroom to the influence of, among others, the English primary model of schooling. In other words, change is attributed to the fact that educators think differently; that there has been development within the profession of education.

But education is not a field, such as mathematics or physics, controlled by scholars and academics. Education is a public service bureaucracy supported by public revenues and controlled by governmental institutions of one variety or another. Thus one must look not only at the range of existing pedagogical styles, which remain relatively constant, but also at the deliberate choice by the government in power of which form of education it chooses to enforce upon the

people under its control. Educational historians should, therefore, study the factors which influence these decisions about institutional structures and pedagogical styles. From this perspective, the following propositions will form the basis for a model of how education changes in America.

1. Educational innovation is a variable dependent upon the economic structure of the society and the racial, sexual and cultural mores that derive from this structure. The development of the practice of public education is not determined by growth within the profession; rather the pace and direction of that growth is determined by the needs of the economic system. In America, this causal relationship is both defined and modified by the existence of racism and sexism.

2. These economic needs are transferred into educational arguments by means of ideologies which obscure the basic class, racial and sexual interests at stake. It is neither possible nor beneficial for any group to openly explain the benefit it would derive from a given educational change. In the majority of cases, the group is not even explicitly conscious of its motives and, in any case, a decision to state publicly this rationale would jeopardize the legitimacy of the position and its advocates. Therefore, the self-interest of a class or a race is expressed in terms which imply general benefit in abstract principles. For the purposes of this essay, that will be the operative definition of an ideology.

3. When under the control of the ruling economic coalition, it is the

function of the government to enforce educational decisons, thus masking socio-economic interest in the mantle of public legitimacy. Education is only one function of any given government. Public service institutions such as the police, the legal structure, the health services, are administered to promote the interests of the state which are in harmony with the interests of the classes, or coalition of classes which support them. Given the prevalent ideology, such institutions are supposedly administered "for the common good." Education, though it has been mythologized and supposedly professionalized, is not an exception to this rule: schools are simply one more function of the state.

4. Innovations enforced by the government can be divided into two separate, but interacting categories: development in the structure of educational institutions; and reform in the pedagogical modality or style of teaching. Decisions in the first instance include: who goes to school, who progresses to what level of schooling, who pays for schooling and in what proportion, who should control education, and by what mechanism should students be processed? These determinations create the form of educational institutions and select who has access to them. Innovation in the second category concerns the consequences of distinctive pedagogical styles upon the way in which students are taught to perceive themselves, their peers, and their physical environment. These styles have a direct relation to the anticipated economic function of the person after the termination of schooling. Such decisions include the shaping of the role of the teacher, the level of competition in the classroom, the norms of interaction

between students, and the relationship of the learner to the object of study. These determinations of style affect the manner in which individuals of similar cognitive ability and different social backgrounds relate to their environment.

5. Both the structure and the modality of education must ultimately reflect the dominant economic character of the society because of the pervasive influence of the means of production. As the goods and services necessary for survival are available only in exchange for money, income - therefore labor - is a preprequisite for existence. In a capitalist economy the sources and managers of wealth determine the characteristics of the work roles from which one must choose. Survival in our economy thus necessitates the ability to function within one of the accessible work roles.

This interrelationship is consciously or subliminally perceived by students and educators. By observing older people through familial or neighborhood associations, students are keenly aware of the bounds of acceptable behavior which work roles have constructed. This set of perceptions must force a decision to either mimic these characteristics, or accept the possibility of economic retribution. As their consistent preaching demonstrates, teachers are also conscious of what employers perceive as acceptable modes of behavior in the jobs potentially available for a given class or students. Through reenforcement and sanction, teachers use their classroom environment to develop those characteristics. Because of the dialectic of interrelationship between students and teachers perception of projected roles, the educational system prepares

young people to function in one available form of labor or another. This perceived necessity for education to serve the function of economic preparation establishes the basic linkage between the economic structure of society and the educational system. It is through this process of deduction from the necessity of income to the formation of character that the pervasive influence of the means of production determines the basic structure of education.

This development as outlined in points one through five neither implies that all men make conscious choices acting out some Machiavellian archetype; nor does it negate the existence of contradictions and confusions within classes. It goes without saying that the majority of educators are motivated by a genuine concern for their pupils. In performing their tasks for the benefit of the students, few could explain the relationship between their activities and the needs of a developing economy. The few individuals who do understand the complex set of political and economic consequences of the pedagogical decisions made, are in positions which have trained them not to explain these implications. But for the most part, teachers who serve as agents of oppression do not necessarily have malicious intent. Rather, they act from a distorted idea of what is beneficial, distortions which stem from the prevailing ideology of society.

This indirect relationship between the motivating forces in the economic structure and the oppressive agent in the schools negates the possibility of any one-to-one correspondence between class interests and a particular educational decision. Individual educational decisions stem not from grandiose designs,

but from immediate and concrete concerns, e.g., people seeking small solutions to particular problems confronting them at present. In other words, individuals with similar goals can make differing interpretations of the best tactic to achieve those goals in particular cases.

Aside from such idiosyncratic behavior, divergent approaches in education might also be explained by a conflict between elements of the same class who represent antagonistic tendencies within that class and translate this into educational policy. "Class interest" in education is not a single, easily specified institution or set of characteristics, but the complex and often contradictory set of policies which, in their particular way, seek to support one economic system over another. For example, the Nixon Administration has systematically dismantled the educational machinery established by its Democratic predecessors. However, this antagonism represents two different interpretations of the most effective way for education to support the state. As such, the relationship exemplifies a conflict within a class, which is distinct from a conflict between two classes. These differences in tactics within a class due neither to ideosyncratic behavior or competing material bases give the development of education its uneven pattern of growth.

CHAPTER II

THE MECHANISMS OF SCHOOLING

> The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling idea; i.e., the class, which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it.[1]

The prophets of educational reform have proposed a series of remedies to the "malaise affecting American education": from the high school and tracking system of the nineteenth century to the alternative schools, designs for humanistic education, and the open classroom models currently in vogue. Their advocates imply that each of these innovations provides a foundation for the reconstruction of the educational process. However, while each of these structural alterations does create a degree of potential lacking in the conventional system, none of them inherently presents a basic change in the destructive process of socialization as practiced by the schools. This phase of the argument will first define the process of socialization as it applies to schooling, discuss the cognitive styles which develop from this process, and then present three research studies.

The Process of Socialization

By the term "socialization" I mean the inculcation of ideological premises and intellectual modalities into the minds of young children. Talcott Parsons further defines the socialization process, as the development in children of the commitments and capacities which are prerequisites of their future role-performance. He specifies the two components of commitment as: "Commitment to the implentation of the broad values of a society, and commitment to the performance of a specific type of role within the structure of society."[2] Young children must come to accept the general values of their culture, and to adopt a rigidly defined function which categorizes them within a differentiated social structure.

Jean Piaget, among others, asserts that this process is not inherently a negative one. In fact, it symbolizes the development of an isolated individual into a member of any given society:

> For the fundamental fact of human psychology is that society, instead of remaining almost entirely inside the individual organism as in the case of animals. . .becomes crystallized almost entirely outside the individuals. In other words, social rules, as Durkheim has to powerfully show. . . cannot be constituted, transmitted, or preserved by means of an internal biological heredity.[3]

The mechanisms of intellectual discrimination of an adult are not instinctive derivatives, but the results of training in social behavior.

As Piaget also demonstrates in The Moral Judgement of the Child, it is impossible for a child to choose which of these demands or social rules will form the foundation of his character; the child is simply prey to the pressure of

example and overt direction as provided by adult society. Unfortunately one of the fundamental purposes of bourgeois educational theory, in fact bourgeois psychology as a whole, has been to muddle this distinction between natural and societal traits. For example, Jerome Kagen's definition of man's motivational structure illustrates an inability to distinguish learned behavior from innate behavior.

> One of the basic characteristics of man is his attempt to maintain a balance between the desire to differentiate himself from a larger group with less resources than he commands and an equally strong desire to make himself similar to a group who he believes possess more resources.[4] (emphasis added)

To maintain such an assertion is to deny the mass of data collected by cross-cultural anthropologists (e.g., John Middleton, From Child to Adult; Wax, Diamond, Gearing, Anthropological Perspectives on Education).

In the competitive atmosphere of capitalist society, people generally react in the manner postulated by Kagen. But to generalize from this observation that such behavior reflects innate human characteristic is to obliterate the distinction between socialized behavior and biological characteristics. More precisely, the behavior which Kagen identifies results from the demands of the social structure rather than the nature of man. Using an example from the home life of a young child, presents an excellent model of this learning process. In a systematic attempt to understand the child's ability to distinguish between motives causing an action and the material results of that act, Piaget related the following two stories to a group of young people:

1. A little boy who is called John is in his room. He is called to dinner. He goes into the dining room. But behind the door there was a chair, and on the chair there was a tray with fifteen cups on it. John couldn't have known that there was all that behind the door. He goes in, the door knocks against the tray, bang go the fifteen cups and they all get broken!

2. Once there was a little boy whose name was Henry. One day when his mother was out he tried to get some jam out of the cupboard. He climbed up on to a chair and stretched out his arm. But the jam was too high up and he couldn't reach it and have any. But while he was trying to get it he knocked over a cup. The cup fell down and broke.[5]

After reading the stories to the children, Piaget asks the following questions with (I) standing for the interviewer and (S) for the subject:

I: Have you understood these stories?
S: Yes
I: What did the first boy do?
S: He broke eleven cups.
I: And the second one?
S: He broke a cup by moving roughly.
I: Why did the first one break the cups?
S: Because the door knocked them.
I: And the second?
S: He was clumsy. When he was getting the jam, the cup fell down.
I: Is one of the boys naughtier than the other?

S: The first is because he knocked over twelve cups.
I: If you were the Dad, which one would you punish most?
S: The one who broke the twelve cups.[6]

Piaget deduces from dialogues such as the one above that no matter how many homilies the child has heard about motive and intention being more important than material possession, the child bases his judgment not on the unspoken thoughts, but on the observation of objective results. The subject has understood that authorities would punish him in a manner determined by the amount of damaged property, not in relation to his abstract motives. But by reacting to what adults do as opposed to what they say, children readily comprehend the operative value structure of their superiors. Thus, in the example structured by Piaget, the child must respond that "Dad" would punish the child who broke the larger amount of property regardless of the circumstances which surrounded the accident.

Leonard Kholberg, in his research studies, would argue that normal development alters this direct correlation by children, allowing them to deal more extensively with motive and intentionality. However true that contention may be in theory, it fails to alter the argument because, even on that more abstract level, children are also the observers of reality. Though a teacher may continually assert that his/her job is to treat all children equally, regardless of race, religion, or national origin, etc., yet when he/she acts in such a way as to perpetuate racist, sexist, and bourgeois attitudes, it is the reality of the action which is psychologically significant in the development of the child's consciousness, rather than the rhetorical flourishes. Kholberg positions

that the increased attention by children to abstraction negates the objective natures of morality, is significant if, and only if, the motives exposed are in fact, the real motivating forces. In circumstances when abstraction belies the reality, children can also observe and learn from that discrepancy.

The School as Socializing Agent

Within this framework the school functions as one of many socializing agencies. Fred L. Strodtbeck, in his studies of Jewish and Italian family life in New Haven, attempts to identify the element of family values and interactional patterns which relates to high achievement. He argues that Jews inculcate:

1. A belief that the world is orderly and amenable to rational mastery; that therefore, a person can and should make plans which will control his destiny;
2. A willingness to leave home to make one's way;
3. A preference for individual rather than collective credit,

and that such norms are the main determinants of economic success.[7] Schooling does not necessarily alter socializing processes of the family. But it has that potentiality. Whatever the ideological position of the school, that position will have a systematic impact of the development of social norms.

Schools as an institution must choose either to struggle against or reinforce these pre-existing value structures; and largely they are successful.

Any examination of this impact is hampered by the almost total lack of research efforts focused on the process itself. For example, in one encyclopaedic volume, Gage's Handbook of Research on Teaching, only one chapter out of twenty-three deals with social interaction: nine are devoted to research on teaching various grade levels and subject matters, six on measurements, etc. For whatever their reasons, the scholars have chosen generally to ignore the systematic installation of social precepts in the classroom.

Those studies which have some value are best summarized in Robert Dreeban's "Contribution of Schooling to the Learning of Norms." In that article, he delineates the significant characteristics of the school as a social institution:

1. First protracted institutionalized contact outside of the home;
2. Evaluation and control removed from parents;
3. Instruments of power related specifically to function rather than to ascriptive roles;
4. First experience with centralized control by the few over the many;
5. Homogeneity of grouping (by age and/or intelligence).[8]

While any institution or environment has the power to influence behavior, each of these factors contributes to the particular ability of the school to inculcate social norms.

Children experience, as they gradually move away from the home, an increasing number of institutions: schools, governmental agencies, hospitals, churches, the military, etc. While laissez-faire ideologists assert that each institution relates to its clientele as individuals, in fact, there exists a

commonality primarily within the treatment given to particular individuals within social groupings. There is undoubtedly a distinction in the way institutions process lower-class black males as opposed to upper-class white females, or between lower-class white males and lower-class black females.

The realization of one's status in this hierarchy develops through a lengthy and complex process, one in which the school plays a significant part. Not only can children perceive the differential in treatment within a given classroom, or within the school to which they are assigned, but they are also able to deduce from contact with parents and peers the relationship of their race or class to the educational system. Since the contact between the child and the school is the first protracted social institution, the manner in which the child is processed by the institution has a major influence in determining the child's perceptions of his or her relationship to the race and class in power.

These influences are heightened by the internal characteristics of the school. For the first time, the function of evaluation and control is removed from the family for a significant portion of the day. The impact of that percentage of time removed from the family becomes magnified by the additional role of the person who wields it. Discipline or praises distributed not only by Mrs. Jones, but through Mrs. Jones who functions as a <u>teacher</u>, as a representative of massive institutionalized power, to whom the child must relate. In other words, the power of the teacher as an individual is magnified by the the ascriptive power of the role in which the individual functions.

> Schooling contributes to the capacity to make the distinction (and the obligation to do so) by making it possible for pupils to discover that different individuals can occupy a single social position but act in a way that can be discovered as attached to the position rather than to the different persons filling it. Even though all members. . . find themselves in the same circumstances, are about equal in age, and resemble each other in social characteristics related to residence, they still differ in many respects - sex, race, ethnicity, and physical characteristics being among the most obvious.[9]

Further, the continued vascillating development in the relationship between the two polarities in this dichotomy imply that certain situations demand the precedence of one over the other; that, for example, sexual distinction provides the basis for role models while class distinction provides the basis for achievement; or that race functions to determine commonality in one social situation and sex in another.

Patterns of Socialization under Capitalism

In a community, a social structure in which commonly defined goals exist, socialization represents only the perpetuation of an agreed-on tradition. For example, in China or Cuba, one of the crucial functions of socialization is the preservation of the revolutionary tradition for a generation that has never experienced the oppression of the Manchus or the regime of Batista. However, the aims held by those who currently control school systems in urban areas are vastly different from the aims of the parents who are forced by law and the absence of feasible alternatives to yield their children to the public schools. In such a situation it is crucial to understand concretely the methods by which the educational system inculcates norms in small children. Although this process

permeates all levels of education, the basic patterns are established in young grade school children; thus an examination of their manipulation establishes the relationship between socialization and capitalism.

This manipulation takes place on two levels: that of overt ideological precepts, and that of artificially induced patterns of thought. Examples of the first category are obvious: children learn that Indians were wild savages; success results from hard work in our egalitarian social structure; women stay home, cook and are generally subservient to men; and that nice boys and girls respect the President. The success of this indoctrination can be judged by the inability of the majority of Americans to even acknowledge that the above are arguable premises; rather, they are fundamental facts of life akin primarily to biblical litany. While the presentation of these homolies may vary from school to school, there exists a definite uniformity in the ideological curriculum which transcends racial and class categories and is easily identifiable by anyone capable of transcending the limitations of this historical perspective.

Such is not the case with regard to the second category: the creation in young children of a particular style of thought or intellectual modality. In this subtle differentiation in the way a child thinks, as opposed to what a child thinks, lies the most insidious effect of industrial capitalism upon the educational system.

An economy such as ours requires individuals who possess different intellectual characteristics and it is among these schools' tasks to foster this

differentiation. For example, according to the literature of the Harvard Business School an executive needs an ability to assimilate large quantities of information and to forge an applicable plan of action out of this mass of raw data. While it slightly stretches the term creativity to describe this process, at least such an individual must have the confidence in his intellect to pursue the course of action which he has outlined. On a lower level of this bureaucratic hierarchy, perhaps in an insurance company or in a bank, middle level personnel need only have the ability to execute policy. In other words, their minds need only accurately pursue a direction established by their superiors. In a somewhat different situation as assembly-line worker must learn to repress any thought while he or she is at work. It is not only functionally unnecessary, but potentially dangerous to use one's intellectual capacity operating the same machine in the same motion eight hours a day. It is a testament to the power of the working classes that daily more and more people struggle to transcend this attempt at social stratification. Yet, in the necessity to wage that struggle for self-preservation is found the strongest proof of the economic system's deliberate attempt to stratify intellectual modes on the basis of potential work roles.

On the other hand, it is necessary to accept a degree of impotence to remain passively chained to a machine, unable to control minimal bodily movements. Moreover, neither extreme is found consistently in a pure form; rather it indicates generally that different socio-economic positions require, and in

turn reinforce, particular psychological and emotional characteristics. In part, many of these characteristics result from the nature of a given child's home life and peer group relations. Yet, the role played by the school system in either perpetuating patterns learned elsewhere or in the creation of new ones can not be underestimated because of the schools ability to create new modes of conceptualization.

At his most basic level Piaget is concerned about categories of knowledge which have validity, independent of cultural, policies or personal circumstances, In The Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child, he claims that the acquisition of such information implies

> a process of research and discovery during the course of which the human intelligence affirms its own existence and its properties of universality and autonomy: a mathematical truth is not dependent upon the contingencies of adult society, but upon a rational construction accessible to any healthy intelligence.[10]

Given this accessibility, the manner in which educators force children to pursue these universal laws inculcates a pattern of thought. This manner reflects the social goals of the educational system rather than the concepts inherent in the subject matter. On the one hand, the teacher can present addition, multiplication, and division tables as simply pre-existing realities. The child can respond to this mass of facts in one of two ways: either by passive submission, or what the school would categorize as deviant behavior. If the child submits, he or she must simply become accustomed to the physical realities of the mathematical universe. The psychological consequences of this pedagogical technique are

endless. Not only does the method imply that the child personally is incapable of creating the correct answer, the child also learns that the proper path to receive the positive sanction is by arbitrarily following the intellectual patterns of an authoritarian figure.

Contrast this procedure with one structured around cuisenaire rods. Ideally, the child's mathematical ability stems from his own discovery of the logical patterns of mathematical thought, the belief that his mind can create the linkage between the physical world and the abstraction of numbers. In this comparison, any questions as to which child "knows more math" present an irrelevant statement of the issue. What is necessary to note is the contrasting psychological and intellectual patterns established by the respective methods of teaching identical "fact." Year after year of exposure to the first method could only train a child to dismiss the creative powers of his own brain in favor of a sublimation of his individuality into the methodology of the teachers. In this situation, the child conceives of his mental activity as a process which inherently follows external direction. The usage of cuisenaire rods would, hopefully, avoid this self-imposed limitation by fostering a child's faith in his own ability to think. By using his own mental powers to arrive at identical conclusions, the child's faith in himself as a learner can be reinforced

The characteristics of these contrasting modes of pedagogy have political and cultural significance. Before the examination moves to that level, it is important to consider a second concrete example, one which illustrates the

subtle working of race and class oppression in the creation of intellectual behavior patterns: the teaching of reading. The prime instrument in this process is the ever-present primer. Within the confines of their peculiar world, Dick and Janeism ruled; or, at least until very recently, they created the tone which characterized early childhood texts. That the characteristics of this world parody the racist and sexist attitudes of our culture should be a well-known fact. And while the diversification of these characteristics represents an improvement, to limit change at that point would be to leave the core of the destructive power of this primer unaffected.

In any text, the structural characteristics of the language is as important as the surface nature of the story. As the research conducted by the Center for the Study of Applied Linguistics illustrates in "academic terminology," e.g., Baratz and Shuy, Teaching Black Children to Read, language varies according to race and class status. These variations reflect not only obvious differences in vocabulary, but alterations in the generic principles of grammatical and phonetic construction. Further, "English" dialectics other than standard Englishare not degenerate mutations but an equally sophisticated construction based on different syntaxtical principles.

When Black, Spanish or lower-class whites encounter the language of the primer, they encounter a language other than their own, forcing the child to learn simultaneously a unfamiliar grammatical form and the principles of reading. This impediment to learning is only the first debilitating consequence

of a discrepancy betwen the childs' language and institutional language. In these early grades, the child is being taught to appreciate on an emotional level his social inferiority. The message is conveyed that his language and the language of parents and friends does not warrant societal recognition. His words, the words which express his thoughts and emotions, do not exist in the written pages. From this fact, children draw from experience the conclusion that, in general, neither their thoughts nor their emotions have any relevance to the school, and indirectly to society. This process is inherently a harmful one, but when it becomes a tool for discrimination based on racial class the process transforms itself into a vehicle for cultural imperialism: all true culture is the culture of the ruling class; ergo, any different form represents a degenerative form.

White middle-class children, on the other hand, quickly learn that the language of the school is their language, that they are in fact, the chosen ones. Certainly, the primer carefully sanitizes the emotional spectrum presented to white children, but the social context in which Dick and Jane function is their own, or at least one to which they may reasonably aspire. Just as the foreigness of the material creates in lower-class children a sense of their worthlessness, the familiar and supportive milieu of the school reinforces the confidence of middle-class children. There are exceptions to this rule that lower class children are debilitated and middle-class children partially supported. Some

black children escape from the school system intact while some middle-class whites are emotionally destroyed; but such instances occur in spite of rather than because of the school.

The two preceding examples have stressed, for the purpose of the argument, the class-related differentials in intellectual modalities. Clearly, there also exist similarities in the way many classes are education, just as certain character traits link together the various social classes. In her study of urban classrooms, Eleanor Burke Leacock observed a number of patterns which transcended class categories, primarily the installation of competition in the children. The social organization of the classroom, i.e., the assignment of necessary tasks, the election of officers, was designed in such a way as to force the children to work against each other in order to receive the rewards of the teacher. Even learning was as often as not perceived as a way to separate oneself from classmates in order to receive the approval of the dominant authority figure. In such a context it is easy to lose sight of the possibility that learning can be experienced as an inherent pleasure, or more importantly, as a constructive contribution to the development of the classroom group and the larger communities. Competitive patterns certainly do not originate in school, but the school does teach the child that competitive behavior is what social institutions expect as a precondition for success.

Three Research Examples

This analysis of the process of socialization is supported by three significant empirical studies of classrooms: Eleanor Burke Leacock's Teaching and Learning in City Schools, Raymond Rist's "The Process of Socialization in the Elementary Classroom," and Herbert Gintis' "Characteristics of Worker Productivity." Each book or essay attempts to determine the systemic patterns which govern teacher-student interactions in schools, and the relationship between these patterns, educational achievement, and social stratification.

Rist's study, originally published in the Harvard Educational Review examines the implication of social variables on the pedagogical organization of a classroom: the process "whereby out of a large group of children and an adult unknown to one another, a pattern of behaviors," i.e., of expectation and performance, developed in a system of stratification unrelated to intellectual ability. Rist's initial premise was that of expectations of kindergarten teachers about the academic potential of students was determined by a subjective interpretation of the student's attitudes and characteristics. Teachers, Rist postulated, search for ideal types which possess the characteristics necessary for school success and life success. The components of this typography can be related significantly to the characteristics of race and social class.[11]

In the St. Louis classroom utilized for the study, teachers had available to them prior to the opening of school three sets of information about each child: (1) preregistration forms with name and home address; (2) a list from the school social worker of all students on welfare; and (3) results of an interview with mother and child during the registration period covering behavioral issues, i.e., bed wetting, stealing, etc. As Rist notes, none of these sources of information can be shown to have any direct relationship to the ability of a kindergarten-age child to learn. Rather, the social information available, i.e., financial status, kind and quality of medical care, presence or absence of a telephone, number of siblings, presence of both parents, neighborhood location, etc., establishes or reinforces conceptions of behavior that the teacher can associate with real or imagined racial or class characteristics. Thus, prior to the opening of school, the teacher has no knowledge about the child's ability to learn, other than the unsubstantiated mythologies which support any propensity of the teacher to correlate racial and class background with cognitive ability.[12]

This set of information about social characteristics is increased by the data the teacher received from the physical characteristics of the child during the first weeks of school. Specifically, the children in the classroom used in the study differed in (1) their general physical appearance, i.e., body odor, dress, hair, quality of clothing, etc.; (2) their interactional behavior - aggressive, passive, efforts to please teacher, peer groups chosen, etc.; and (3) their use of language - ability to employ standard English of the school as opposed, for example, to black English. These three points are members of a set that could quite literally be infinite.

Essentially this set is a compilation of the attributes of social class, race, and personality that are unconnected to what Piaget described above as rational or cognitive processes. The task here is not to attempt to generate a listing of even a substantial portion of such attributes. It is only necessary to delineate the category of information available to the teacher when she begins to make decisions, conscious or unconscious, about the intellectual ability of the child; and to underscore the lack of relationship between that information and the child's cognitive ability.

On the eighth day of class, permanent seating assignments were made, placing the children at one of three tables with table one representing the more, and table three the least "intelligent" young people. Given that all the children in the sample were black, thus eliminating race as a discriminating factor, it is important to note the clear correlation between social class and the seating arrangement as established in the following table:

Table I

Distribution of Socio-Economic Status Factors by Seating Arrangement at the Three Tables in the Kindergarten Classroom

	Factors	Seating Arrangement* Table 1	Table 2	Table 3
	Income			
1)	Families on welfare	0	2	4
2)	Families with father employed	6	3	2
3)	Families with mother employed	5	5	5
4)	Families with both parents employed	5	3	2
5)	Total family income below $3000/yr**	0	4	7
6)	Total family income above $12,000/yr**	4	0	0
	Education			
1)	Father ever grade school	6	3	2
2)	Father ever high school	5	2	1
3)	Father ever college	1	0	0
4)	Mother ever grade school	9	10	8
5)	Mother ever high school	7	6	5
6)	Mother ever college	4	0	0
7)	Children with pre-school experience	1	1	0
	Family Size			
1)	Families with one child	3	1	0
2)	Families with six or more children	2	6	7
3)	Average number of siblings in family	3-4	5-6	6-7
4)	Families with both parents present	6	3	2

*There are nine children at Table 1, eleven at Table 2, and ten children at Table 3.
**Estimated from stated occupation.

The significance of this stratficiation by class is the extent to which it determined the patterns of interaction between the teacher and her students and, in response to that difference, between the students themselves. Social class within a racial group became a way of defining how a child was taught to think as opposed to what amount of information each child received. In other words, the teacher established differential patterns of social behavior in different socio-economic class groupings while attempting to convey identical information.

Distinctions existed in the quantifiable amount of teaching time each group received and in the style of that teaching. According to clock measures, children designated as possessing "high ability" received a significantly greater amount of teacher instructional time than those categorized as slow learners. While this differential is important in explaining the correlation between the teacher's prophecy and student achievement, a second dichotomy relates more directly to the class characteristics of learning patterns. Students from high socio-economic backgrounds at table I were directed towards learning by directing their activities towards rewards and by direct contact, though not necessarily learning-related contact, with the teacher.

On the other hand, students from lower socio-economic groupings were directed towards learning by control-oriented admonishments, and generally experienced little supportive behavior from the teacher.[14] This differentiation permeated the non-academic activities of the class:

> Within a few days, only a certain group of children was continually being called on to lead the class in the Pledge of Allegiance, read the weather calendar each day, come to the front for 'show and tell' periods, take messages to the office, pass out materials for class projects, be in charge of equipment on the playground, and lead the class to the bathroom, library or on a school tour.[15]

The teacher utilized her power to delegate activities to enforce her definition of leadership and responsibility onto the students. Again, this power was used to reenforce dominant economic groups and to penalize the victims of exploitation.

Given this foundation in social and academic activity, inevitably the students respond to the persistent stimuli of the teacher by developing norms of relationship among themselves which mimicked the class divisions established by the teacher. For example, high status students at table 1 began to ridicule and belittle students at tables 2 and 3, and used their allegiance with the teacher to enforce the teacher's wishes on rebellious students in the lower "tracts."[16]

The significance of the Rist study lies in the correlation of social class with a particular style of teaching and learning. Beyond the crude facts of stratification, the power of the teacher was utilized to create particular cognitive attributes which were applicable to the predictable future economic and social roles of the kindergarten students. Wealthy students were rewarded for initiative and quite simply granted the right to begin in a playful way to exercise power over others, while lower-class children were taught to be accustomed to motivational as an avoidance of punishment and to a general lack of control over self and others.

In Teaching and Learning in City Schools, Eleanor Burke Leacock affirms this correlation in her examination of eight urban classrooms. Using data from one fifth-grade and one second-grade classroom in four schools - lower-income black, lower-income white, middle-income black, and middle-income white - the study dealt with the question: "what is actually being taught, being conveyed to children; it is totality, in so far as we can discover it, in classrooms which represent major social-economic groupings in an urban center."[17] By using direct observation, interviews with teachers, and interviews with students, Teaching and Learning in City Schools provides the justification of comparative research to the interrelationship between the function of schools and capitalism.

On one level, Leacock documents the existence of the commonly shared ideological principles and generally repressive pedagogical methodologies. For example, the study found that most teachers failed to distinguish between an intellectual concept and a moral precept. When attempting to teach social studies, the teacher would talk about the pioneers and the frontier to convey to the class America's conception of admirable characteristics. Needless to say, these quaint morality plays failed to deal with the hunger for profit that drove America to develop the West or the genocide of the native Americans which made that development possible. In general, teachers in all classrooms sampled utilized social and political concepts to convey ideological rather than scientific history:

> Instead of inquiry, questioning, explaining the significance of various happenings, teaching by and large involved a repetition of events and search for predetermined interpretations of these events as drawn from the children through the medium of question-answer interchange of 'discussion'.[18]

By simply repeating the facts of history without inquiring into underlying economic political causes for events. As in this instance, teachers use the events of the past to justify the obvious power relationships of the present.

Similarly, the study noted a commonality in the repressive organizational structure of the classroom. Out of the literally hundreds of citations listed to legitimize the perjorative term "repressive," two indicate the nature of Leacock's approach. Observers attempted to tally all teacher responses to children's statements, answers, or questions according to whether they closed or opened up a subject. For the purpose of this tabulation, which included non-verbal responses, responses judged as closing were those which accepted, evaluated or corrected. The study found that

> closing responses were far more frequent than those which elaborated on the child's responses. In three of the second-grade classrooms only one in every ten of the teacher's responses opened up a subject.[19]

The pattern of activity on the part of the teachers creates in the student the belief that learning involves accepting what is presented by the authority figure, rather than learning involves the development by the child of thoughts or ideas which relate to his or her experiences to the subject at hand.

This reliance on authority as opposed to learning permeated the rationale for discipline as stated by teachers in each of the sample rooms. Goals for behavior were not explained as related to learning, but as related to pleasing

the teacher, or as a vehicle for competitive relationships with peers. Instead of linking discipline to learning, self respect or safety, teachers use such remarks as, "I'm quite proud of a number of children. Let's make me proud of you again. . . Henry, it is your job to see if you can be the best boy, or is Joseph going to be the best boy?" or, "I will choose two lovely children to show their book reports to our visitors. I will only choose two of the nicest people, the two with the best self-control."[20] Control is not related to a logical rationale which respects the dignity of the class and attempts to explain the relationship between discipline and learning. Rather, control is related to the manipulation of the class made possible by the teacher's power to distribute sanctions and rewards.

Within the constructs of these commonly shared characteristics of classroom environments, Leacock's study team did observe differentials between classrooms that could clearly be related to the racial and class composition of the institution. Such distinctions became apparent on a more subtle plane of analysis, i.e., in the variations in how children were being taught to talk and act with their superiors and with their peers. These variations related to three basic activities indicated by the teacher:

1. The informal structuring of relations between herself and the children and among the children through the allocation of responsibilities, class officers and the like;

2. the informal structuring of relationships through the way the teachers actually managed the class and what was in fact allowed and disallowed;
3. the goals for behavior imparted to children through the teacher's differential behavior towards different children, and the types of children generally favored, disfavored or ignored in a given classroom.[21]

The particular style adopted by the teachers in relation to these three constructs in part determined the attempt of the teacher to socialize the students to norms related directly to their socio-economic position. Two examples illustrate this pattern: teachers ideas about leadership, and teacher attitudes towards pupils as related to intelligence and achievement.

In the middle-income, white, fifth grade, the teacher created an elaborate system of classroom governance with presidents, vice-presidents, monitors for the library, the window sills, monitors to collect newspapers, milk money, lunch money and even monitors to collect the trash. This system gives everyone, according to the teacher, "the chance to be a leader." Needless to say, this responsibility exercised by the students is nominal rather than actual, with the teacher maintaining the right to revoke responsibility at any point:

> Leaders are for many things. It's a feeling they have that they are conducting the lesson, but actually I am in the background constantly and many times, if there is a wrong answer given, I will intercept, which is my prerogative, and find out why and explain.[22]

However, regardless of the obvious nature of the sham, the teacher is attempting to accurately portray to the students their potential role relationships in society. The system of monitors gives each student a sense of control over the environment and experience in control over peers. In this vein, even the nominal nature of the responsibility accurately portrays future work relationships: middle-managers in government or corporate structures do exercise control within a strictly defined series of constraints, the violation of which leads to the revocation of authority.

The pattern of classroom management is distinctly different in the lower-income, black fifth grade. While the class is permitted to elect officers, it became evident from the teacher's words that they exist as little more than obvious instruments of her will and control. For example, the main function of the president is to bring up the line in the morning. In contrast to the elaborate delegation of minor labor in the middle-income school, the classroom in the black school has no monitoring system because of the threat to order which such delegation might represent. The only exception is the selection of a student to "serve the office" on Wednesday at which time the teacher looks "around for a boy [sic] who is neat and clean."[23] In this structure, there exists little room for the niceties of responsibility; the students are learning to receive and execute orders for persons in unquestionable positions of authority.

To establish this dichotomy in the leadership styles developed by the teachers in the classroom of different racial and socio-economic groupings is not to deduce that the children will "learn more" cognitive information in one

setting than in another, though that, too, is likely. The emphasis here is on the relationship between the way in which the teacher approaches learning and the correlation between the pedagogical style and the future work role anticipated for the students. Capitalism has created different patterns of authority which operate at different levels of the socio-economic hierarchy. Persons occupying middle-income positions must learn to exercise power over others, though always with the understanding that this power is inherent in the institution and its rules and procedures rather than emanating from themselves. On another level, capitalism attempts to subject working class people to roles in which the acceptance of orders without any illusion of individual control or initiative represents the epitome of the "good worker." In the patterns of leadership developed by the two fifth-grade teachers, the school is functioning as the efficient weapon of the economic system by directly intervening in the socialization process to prepare young people for societal roles based on the teachers' perception of their potential.

This projection of anticipated social status into the classroom also affected the relationship between the students intelligence as measured by scores and teacher attitudes:

> In the middle-income white schools, the children toward whom the teacher felt most positive had an average IQ score of some eleven points higher than those toward whom she felt negative. Those toward whom she felt neutral fell in between. . . This was not the the case in the low-income Negro school. Here the children about whom the teacher felt positive or neutral has an average IQ score almost ten points lower than those about whom she felt negative.[24]

There exist a number of behavior traits that explain this reversal, e.g., in black schools the content of the institution is so oppressive as to force students with high I.Q.'s to utilize their minds in "deviant activities," while white children find the curriculum closer to their experiences and therefore channel energies into socially acceptable vehicles. Thus, given a series of such hypotheses, the teacher could conceivably mask the correlation through a series of explanations about order, good manners, solid study habits, and the rest. However, each of these explanations only serves to reinforce the initial point. Regardless of the excuses, the teacher in the middle-income school rewarded intelligence with approval and the teacher in the low-income school responded to intelligence with censure. Again, this pattern parallels the anticipated life roles of the students as perceived by the teacher. Middle-class people are supposed to show initiative and intelligence, and society has provided opportunities for them to do so on a limited basis. But, what the dominant society might term acceptable behavior in white people, is often condemned in black and poor people as presumptious or uppidy. Thus the teacher is, regardless of motive, acting through the distribution of approval to transmit the dominant society's attitudes towards the experiences of intelligence by middle-class whites as opposed to lower-income blacks.

Herbert Gintis' article, "Characteristics of Worker Productivity" attempts to make the same correlations between affective traits and schooling, focusing on the high school level. The primary source of data collected on six hundred forty-nine upper-ability senior high school males was drawn from College Entrance Examination Boards in Math Verbal, Scientific Performance,

Humanities, Comprehension, Science Comprehension, and the administration of a test measuring some sixty-five personality variables. From these sources, he concludes that controlling for I.Q. no combination of any of the five achievement variables can be significantly correlated to grades, while two personality variables, "Citizenship-Teacher Rating (CitT) and Drive to Achieve Student Self-Rating (DrA)," have the greatest power to predict GPA with $p < .001$. This correlation of grades to personality factors rather than achievement leads Gintis to the following conclusions:

A. Since DrA is reward, that subjective motivation is taken in consideration in grading;
B. since these traits are not rewards through their contribution to achievement, that teachers grade independently on the basis of personality;
C. since CitT is postively regarded and can be interpreted as conforming to the dominating role structure of the school, that grading reinforces the student's personality development through participation in the particular structure of social relations in schools; and
D. while grades depend on achievement in general, when "ability" is controlled, little additional effect of achievement can be detected, so the subjective experience of an individual student (who of course cannot control his intelligence) is that grades depend primarily on affective behavior.[25]

The net effect of this series of deductions is that high school students, given a fix level of intelligence, perceive that their success in the institutions is directly related to their ability to conform to the institutions' expectations about their affective characteristics.

Gintis' statistical work confirms the continuation of the existence of the patterns of socialization which Elearnor Burke-Leacock and Raymond Rist

describe in their studies of elementary school environments. The use of the school by capitalism to create and re-create social stratification is evidenced not simply in the amount which students know or in the level of achievement to which they have passed. In fact, as the research indicated, the most powerful effect of the socialization process is in the development of emotionally based patterns of interaction between an individual and the social institutions which dominate his or her life. It is in the variance in these patterns that the class indoctrination of the schooling experiences has its most insidious effects.

If the school system is analyzed in the mode practiced above, the utilization of the schools for the purposes of social, racial, and class indoctrination becomes more complex than the bare facts of brutality, discrimination and failure indicate. If the successful training in a particular mode of thought is the purpose of enforced schooling, then the success of this mission must be judged by different criteria in different circumstances. Thus, the white child who "succeeds" and the Black child who "fails" have, in fact, both been dealt with appropriately by the socialization process.

Footnotes Chapter II

[1]Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The German Ideology (New York: International Publishers, 1947), p. 89.

[2]Talcott Parsons, "The School Class as a Social System," Socialization and Schools (Harvard Educational Review, 1968).

[3]Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgement of the Child (New York: Orion Press, 1970), p. 186.

[4]Jerome Kagen, "Personality and the Learning Process," Creativity and Learning, ed. Jerome Kagen (Boston: Beacon, 1967), p. 155.

[5]Ibid., 122.

[6]Ibid., 124.

[7]Fred L. Strodtbeck, "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement," Talent and Society, ed. David C. McClelland (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958), p. 186.

[8]Summary of article by Robert Dreeben, "The Contribution of Schooling to the Learning of Norms," Socialization and Schools (Harvard Educational Review, 1968).

[9]Ibid., 43.

[10]Jean Piaget, Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child (New York: Orion Press, 1970), p. 26.

[11]Raymond C. Rist, "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 3 (August, 1970), p. 412.

[12]Ibid., 417.

[13]Ibid., 419-20.

[14]Ibid., 414.

[15]Ibid., 419.

[16]Ibid., 426.

[17]Eleanor Burke Leacock, Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 8.

[18]Ibid., 47.

[19]Ibid., 37-38.

[20]Ibid., 63.

[21]Ibid., 116.

[22]Ibid., 116.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., 136.

[25]Herbert Gintis, "Education, Technology, and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity," American Economic Review, May, 1971, p. 272.

PART II

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF REFORM

Introduction

The first section of this thesis presented a theoretical model to describe the relationship between the economic structure of society and its educational system. In the second section, this argument was refined to focus on the exact nature of the contribution education makes to the perpetuation and the development of capitalism. Namely, it was argued that education contributes to social stratification, instills ideological mythologies and, most important, creates modes of perception of self and environment which lead children into particular social class roles.

This section will attempt to demonstrate that the current practices are a continuation of what has been the persistent driving forces in the gensis of American Public Education since its inception as a public bureaucracy in the early nineteenth century. It is important to understand these historical roots of educational innovation in order to avoid seeing current practices as mistakes, or even as the product of a conspiracy perpetrated by evil men. The purpose of this section is to place the current crisis in education into an historical perspective; for an historical background is essential to demonstrate that the current tactics and motives of educational reformers have their roots in the relationship between education and the characteristics of society which have traditionally generated reform movements.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND SOCIETY: 1820-1840

Two periods of innovation stand out as watersheds in the development of American education: the movement for the establishment of free, public schools under a bureaucratic mechanism of control from 1820 to 1840; and the reforms advocated under the banner of progressivism from 1910 to 1930. Because the historical and educational trends which characterize these two periods merge into the broader pattern of growth of the nation, these years establish somewhat artificial points of demarcation. However, the dates in question mark major transitions in the development of the economy, and in the policy of the government in dealing with educational issues. In an examination of the elements of conflict at these transitional points, the inter-relationship between the economic structure of society, the government's power, and educational policy can be seen in concrete historical examples.

Education as the Balance Wheel of Society

The early part of the nineteenth century stands as one of the great periods of social and economic development in American history. The high rate of technological innovation and its application to profit-making enterprises by capitalist investors, coupled with new organizational forms for the production and

distribution of goods, transformed the character of the Eastern seaboard's urban centers. This economic transformation particularly affected the quality of working-class life. Demographic statistics alone indicate the magnitude of the social change: in Massachusetts population increased 24% from 1800 to 1820, 40% from 1820 to 1840, and nearly 60% from 1830 to 1850. This growth was even more accentuated in urban areas: during the same period of time, "the increase in the population of Boston was approximately 73, 115, and 123% respectively."[1] The population sources for the increase stemmed from internal migration and massive immigration.

Frank Tracy Carlton in his Economic Influence Upon Educational Progress describes some of the new industrial processes which absorbed the manpower:

> Among the important inventions and innovations of this period are many which practically revolutionized industrial methods . . . the powerloom, the use of the hot-air blast smelting, the introduction of the anthracite coal into the same industry, in inventions of the mower, the reaper, the sewing machine and the friction match, the introduction of the steam printing press. . . the first steam railroad, three miles in length, was built in 1926. In 1840 the mileage of the steam railroad of the United States was 2,640; in 1850, 9,021. . . The first telegraph line was constructed in 1844.[2]

From the perspective of the twentieth century in which these technologies are commonplace, if not antiquated, it is difficult to imagine their disruptive force on patterns of daily existence. While the nation hardly was industrialized in a decade, these significant changes in the techniques of production brought into being a work force with radically different characteristics and a society which placed new and different demands upon its educational system. As Norman

Ware outlines in his classic The Industrial Worker, laborers were forced to accept degrading work roles which deprived them of the dignifying characteristics of labor in small-scale production.

For the shoemakers in Lynn, to take a concrete example, the introduction of mechanical means of production led to a decline in their social status and to the gradual termination of an entire mode of existence. Traditionally, shoemakers had been regarded as thoughtful and intelligent artisans. Their leather shops commonly served the dual functions of production and education. In many New England shoe-working communities, it was commonplace to hire a young boy to read the paper and other documents while the journeymen pursued their tasks. In the folk wisdom of the period, no village stood higher in the moral, social, and intellectual condition of their inhabitants than the shoe-working communities.[3]

The introduction of large-scale means of production made possible by technological advance and financial consolidation rapidly threatened the independence, culture, and security of artisans such as the shoemakers and the weavers in Lynn and throughout Massachusetts. Certain changes such as the system of store-order payments, were the immediate cause of disruption throughout the East Coast. This disruption typified the plight of dignified artisans who were being degraded into modern industrial workers. Instead of semi-autonomous craftsmen, shoe-workers had been reduced by industrial progress to wage-slaves. No longer operating as self-controlled craftsmen, shoemakers became industrial workers responsible to a centralized organization which controlled the mechanical

tools to which they were subservient, and the distribution of goods they were dependent upon.

On the other hand, more men and women were needed to work in newly created managerial and financial roles in the factories and commercial concerns. In this fashion, the disruption of pre-industrial relationships lead simultaneously to a newly oppressive atmosphere for laboring people, and an expansion of opportunity for those with the skills to contribute to economic growth.

The Ideology of Education: Patricians, Workers and Capitalists

The old patrician class of New England, the increasing number of capitalists, and working people each perceived, though from obviously different perspectives, this interdependent development of a quasi-industrial proletariat and the expansion of opportunity. Their demands for educational reform reflected the freshly created needs of each class to meet the societal consequences of this development in the economy. The extent to which the educational system which emerged from this struggle reflected the needs of a particular class (the needs for social control, economic expansion, or the redistribution of opportunity), is indicative of the power of the groups, or coalition of groups, who controlled the direction of the educational system. The mechanisms of control were direct, such as governmental intervention, and indirect, as in the case of the control of available work roles by capitalists and the unstated threat of disruption by workers.

The arguments presented in the public, while they attempted to state objectives in generally acceptable forms, clearly reflected the biases and objectives of the writer. By examining these ideological assertions about the goals and function of education, the sources of educational innovation can be related back to changes in the social relations of production. In order to elucidate the connection between developing ideologies of education and changes in the economic structure of society, it is necessary to examine the positions of three groups with a vested interest in education: the patricians, the working people, and industrialists. These positions affect conflicting images of the function of schooling and in the characteristics of schools.

Henry Barnard and Dewitt Clinton were college-educated sons of ministers, farmers, and older merchants. As the representatives of a patrician class, they were fast losing their grip upon social and political authority. As these pastoral economic roles would indicate, they were "only remotely connected with the great industrial changes that were sweeping New England."[4] Lacking any immediate control over the direction of society, they attempted to moderate the evils inherent in the inevitable social creations of industrialism. With this in mind, they sought to use education to restrain the competitive excesses of the bourgeoisie, and to civilize and thus pacify the crude laborers they employed. Schools presented an attractive option because: (1) without economic power, they lack a more direct instrument, and (2) education initiated reforms without presenting a disruptive threat to the creation or distribution of

wealth. Themes which link societal unrest with the needs for an educational response dominate the anti-working class writings of the patrician reformers. In the words of the honorable Mayor of New York, Dewitt Clinton:

> A number of benevolent persons had seen. . . the increasing vices of this city, arising in a great degree from the neglected education of the poor. Great cities are at all times the nurseries and hot-beds of crime.[5]

Henry Barnard reiterates the same themes:

> The condition and improvement of her manufacturing population, in connection with the education of the whole people, is at this time the great problem for New England to work out.[6]

Rooted as they were in a genteel tradition, Clinton and Barnard were troubled by the degradation of the working classes. The origins of this anxiety undoubtedly lay in a combination of genuine morality and thinly veiled concern for the potential threat to property from these "nurseries and hot-beds of crime."

On the other hand, these quasi-aristocrats were concerned about the personal and economic style of the new capitalists. First, they blamed them for bringing into existence a new class of employees, persons "not connected to employers by any customary or intimate relations."[7] This lack of traditional patterns of behavior was blamed in part for the disruption in the behavior of the work force. Further, they linked the moral depravity of society on the excesses of the bourgeoisie. In Clinton's words again, how could the poor be kept in order:

> The dreadful examples of vice, which are presented to youth, and the allusive forms in which it is arrayed, connected with a spirit of extravagance and luxury, the never-failing attendant of great wealth and extensive business, cannot fail of augmenting the mass of moral depravity.[8]

The gaudy excesses of the newly rich could only contribute to the lack of moral leadership.

In these passages Clinton was seeking from education both the pacification of the working class and the civilization of the bourgeoisie. Schooling would morally uplift the poor and moderate the vulgarity of the enfranchised. Removed by them lack of economic power for any immediate control, public education was relegated to the task of halting the degeneration of what they so nostalgically and frequently referred to as the "New England character."

With less concern for their own moral habits and with clear goals for a redistribution of wealth, working-class organizations supported certain demands for educational innovation. Though education was in this period often perceived as a mechanism for preserving upper-class privileges, workers increasingly sought to utilize education in an effort to gain social mobility. A resolution passed at a meeting of working men held in New York City in November, 1829, stated:

> Resolved, that the most frivolous species of inequality is that produced by inequality in education, and that a national system of education. . . which shall furnish to all children of the land equal food, clothing, and instruction. . . is the only effectual remedy for this and for almost every other species of injustice.[9]

Echoed in similar manifestoes issued from major Eastern metropolitan areas, working-class people called for an even chance to compete within the ground rules created by industrialism and hoped education would provide them with the resources.

With some exceptions such as the demand for food quoted above and Thomas Skidmore's assertion in "The Rights of Man" that educational changes alone could not serve the function of income distribution, the rhetoric of working-class organizations was more republican than revolutionary. Whatever their motivation, spokesmen demanded only the opportunity to compete on equal terms within the existing structure of society, rather than calling for the reorganization of society itself.

This idealistic republicanism reflected the basically conservative function of working class protests in the period in question. The labor movement, including the agrarianism of George Henry Evans, represented attempts to recreate the past, a past that had been destroyed by advances in industrial methods and financial controls. For the workers, it was

> capitalism that they regarded as the radical force, ruthlessly destroying the little liberties and amenities of another day, a new and alien power rising with the republican framework created by an earlier revolution.[10]

Echoing traditional Jeffersonian rhetoric and the humanitarian concerns of such patricians as Barnard, working people viewed the new industrial and organizational forms as the oppressive force in their lives. This similarity

led to the support by elements of the working classes for reforms advocated by their class antagonists. While the two factions would differ on a definition of a tolerable level of economic stratification in society, both sought the intervention of education to help New England return to pre-industrial social relationships: one through the vehicle of pacification, the other through illusory hopes for the equalization of opportunity.

From his class background Horace Mann could be expected to expouse a patrician ideally. However, in his brilliant weaving together of conversative demands together with the rhetoric of working class protests, he became the articulate spokesman for the utilization of education in the development of industrial capitalism. By concentrating on the reformation of the victims of the economic system, Mann could simultaneously advocate repression, the equalization of economic opportunity, and the development of capitalist production.

This subtle intertwining of antagonistic positions into a coherent ideological position characterized Mann's "Reports to the Massachusetts Board of Education." Each was distinguished by the creation of a single position out of a variety of divergent themes which thinly masked educational reform in narrow class interest. First he repeats without advocating the working class position:

> The main idea set forth in the creeds of some political reformers or revolutionaries is that some people are poor because others are rich. . . the problem presented [to education] for solution is how to transfer a portion of this property from those who are supposed to have too much to those who feel they have too little.[11]

Then he acknowledges the patrician interest:

> Finally, in regard to those who possess the largest shares in the stock of wordly goods, could there, in your opinion, be a police so vigilant and effective for the protection of all rights of persons, property and character, as such a sound, comprehensive education and training as our system of common schools could be made to impart; and would not the payment of a sufficient tax to make such education and training universal be the cheapest means of self-protection and insurance?[12]

Up to this point in the argument, Mann cleverly paraphrases without endorsing both the converative intent that education replace the police as an agency of suppression, and the working class demand that education be substituted for revolution as a means of income re-distribution. However, neither of these positions represent an ideology capable of receiving mass-based support, or of assisting what Mann would term the "constructive development of the democracy." The conservatives' educational program was too repressive to contribute either to domestic tranquility or to economic expansion while income distribution in itself posed a serious threat to capital accumulation.

Liberating himself from both these dilemmas, Mann proposed the novel idea that education could in itself create new wealth. This growth in the supply of capital would raise everyone's economic level, thereby eliminating the necessity for schools to serve a controlling function:

> (education) has a higher function. Beyond the power of diffusing old wealth, it has the prerogative of creating new. It is a thousand times more lucrative than fraud. . . Knaves and robbers can obtain only what was before possessed by others. But education creates or develops new treasures, treasures not before possessed or dreamed of by anyone.[13]

Schooling becomes for Mann the great equalizer, or the balance wheel of the social machinery, simultaneously correcting the distortions of capitalism in the process of promoting economic growth. There exists in this posture a great deal of faith in the power of government intervention, a faith that still survives as one of the motive forces in American liberalism. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., links this faith to larger trends:

> The growth of the impersonality in economic relations enhanced the need for the intervention of the government. As the private conscience grew increasingly powerless to impose effective restraints on the methods of business, the public conscience in the form of the democratic government had to step in to prevent the business community from tearing society apart in its pursuit of profit.[14]

By manipulating the focus of attention away from the conflict and violence inherent in the market place toward a mutually beneficial expansion of the economy, Mann hoped that education could unite all the constituencies of an urban community. The power of this ideology stems from its ability to synthesize antagonistic positions into the theme songs of American democracy.

Conceivably, Mann believed that the reform movement had the potential to achieve these impossible tasks he established for it. But no matter how adroit his argumentation, no verbiage can mask the inability of this economic expansion to lead to economic equality or to the contribution which education made to the development of class stratification. By exploring the characteristics of several competing educational models, the next section of this essay will attempt to describe the process whereby this egalitarian rhetoric was used to

create educational institutions which served the interests of one class rather than the interests of the democracy.

Patterns of School Organization

Each ideological position expressed the intent of a social or economic group to utilize education to impose its will upon society. Before this desire could be translated into an operating policy, the socio-economic group had to (1) control either directly, through the political process, or indirectly through the means of production, the formulation of instructional policy; and (2) have available organizational and pedagogical models for institutions designed to accomplish their educational and political objectives. In Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools, Michael B. Katz presents four alternative models for schooling in the 19th Century, Paternalistic Voluntarism, Democratic Localism, Corporate Voluntarism, and Incipient Bureaucracy. Each of these constructs reflects a variety of political, social, and economic needs of their advocates. Given that in 1820 no model of development symbolized the dominance of one segment of these constituencies and established the power of that class to perpetuate its interests through the vehicle of schooling.

Paternalistic Voluntarism

As exemplified by such creations as the New York Free School Society, paternalistic voluntarism advocated a loose coalition of privately administered educational agencies, directing their services primarily to the poor and the

morally deprived. While it was proposed that a public trust be exercised by such agencies, their organizational structure which relied on a well-endowed private directorate, avoided public accountability and provided few vehicles for contributions from its impoverished and powerless clientele.

This quasi-feudal institution supported out of the public tax levy advocated a pedagogical model which reflects this rigid pattern of noblesse oblige. With "classes" administered roughly along the lines of a factory, knowledge was given to students on an assembly line basis. The class, usually a collection of several hundred students, "was run by a master, who sat on a raised platform in fron. . . and by monitors assigned to each section."[15] During the day, pupils marched from one section to another receiving their knowledge. In the New York Free School Society

> discipline was strict, based often on shame and the use of humiliating punishment. Competition was keenly promoted. The schools were enormous one-room affairs. . . with only one master. . . This form of pedagogy, which reduced education to drill, seemed appropriate because the schools served lower-class children who would without offense be likened to unfinished products, needing to be inculcated with norms of docility, cleanliness, sobriety, and obedience. . . As a result of such schooling, the working class would be alert, obedient and so thoroughly attuned to discipline through group sanctions that a minimum of policing would ensure the preservation of social order.[16]

Regardless of the motive which led to the establishment of such schools, their obvious function was for the rich to engage in a publicly supported pacification program for the purpose of social control of urban populations.

While this rather crude instrument of social policy might have met the needs of that class which was concerned more with conservation than develop-

ment, paternalistic voluntarism as an organizational structure was unable to provide the variety of educational institutions necessary for broad based support. Because the Free School Society dealt only with the poor, and had an indiscriminately deadening effect on its pupils, its schools were unable to contribute to the need of the economy for an increase in skilled manpower, and manpower flexible enough to operate in the variety of functions created by industrialism.

Aside from this pedagogical limitation, its organizational structure was too unadulterated a manifestation of upper-class benevolence and lacked any semblence of democratic trappings for what was increasingly seen as a governmental function. Paternalistic voluntarism was unacceptable because it proposed antiquated methods for the utilization of schooling for the purpose of social control. An educational structure was needed that allowed for a wider base control and a pedagogy that simultaneously served the function of social control while providing for the burgeoning needs of an industrial economy; to use the rhetoric of Horace Mann, an education that both preserved privilege and created wealth.

Democratic Localism

As an organizational mode, democratic localism implied the laissez-faire delegation of responsibility for public schooling from the states to small units of control such as villages, towns, and wards within cities. This pattern of accountability meant in practice that a series of fragmented interest groups, or communities, existing within the same county or municipality, could dictate

their desires to the professionals they employed. Localism was, therefore, an attempt to "adapt to the city an organizational form current in rural areas: the district or community school."[17]

This classically conservative posture led to steadfast opposition to such innovations as the founding of Normal Schools, opposition on the basis that state-regulated production of professional educators constituted a threat to liberty, republicanism, and ultimately to freedom and social stability. It was feared that control by larger units of the state could only lead to the installation of standards which would threaten local autonomy.

Though such a posture has gained increasing legitimacy in urban communities in the late 1960's, to the "radical" forces of nineteenth century capitalism it offered

> as an intellectual construct, a simple explanation and a simple cure for the powerlessness and dislocation induced by the rapid social change of the 1830's and 1840's. . . Unfortunately, it rested on a nostalgic metaphor whose relationship to reality was, at best, problematical.[18]

From one perspective, to hold a small unit of government accountable could hardly represent a realistic antidote to the cause of isolation and powerlessness in the industrial organization of the east. On the other hand, as Schlesinger pointed out, liberalism began to look to larger governmental institutions to implement public policy in a systematic manner to restrain the competitive excesses of the bourgeoise, while simultaneously promoting that expansion of the economy. Democratic localism permitted, even encouraged, a variety of

cultural diversity that would thwart the implementation of such systematic attempts by the state to deal with the skills and consciousness of the work force. Thus, while localism could meet the educational objectives of those workers and partisans who sought solutions in anachronistic models of pre-industrial organization, localism failed to meet the needs of the expanding urban community.

Corporate Voluntarism

Currently prevalent only as the mode of governance for elite, private colleges such as Harvard or Amherst, Katz defines corporate voluntarism simply as

> the conduct of single institutions as individual corporations operated by self-perpetuating boards of trustees and financed either wholly through endowment or through a combination endowment and tuition.[19]

As limited an alternative as this might seem, the victory of public secondary education has obscured the serious consideration given voluntarism during the mid-nineteenth century. Aided as in Massachusetts by the legislative enactment of land-grant subsidies, the academies, as such institutions were called, represented to many the ideal solution to the problem of providing secondary education to a wider cross-section of the population while retaining education in private control. However, the academies embodied in that combination a set of contradictions that led to their demise as a prevelant model for American secondary education.

While maintaining strict private control, the academies avoided the narrowness of their predecessors by removing the declaration of poverty as a stipulation for admittance, thus enlarging the constituency served. Seemingly combining the virtues of the two models above, corporate voluntarism offered disinterested and continuous management out of the field of politics but without the stigma of lower-class affiliation. At the same time the autonomous administration of such schools. This diversification of administrative structure maintained their ability to reflect a variety of local circumstances.

This combination of public goals and private control represented the significant advance and the ultimate weakness of corporate voluntarism: once the conception of a "public school" existed, freed of its blatant class identification and paternalistic purpose, the increasingly democratic rhetoric of the time demanded that such schools be truly public, i.e., owned and operated by the government on a systematic basis. In other words, voluntarism, while meeting the needs of a portion of the interest groups seeking educational reform, failed to provide an ideological umbrella large enough to produce the necessary support.

Incipient Bureaucracy

The existence of bureaucratic forms of control have become so accepted as to obscure the radical departure from prior patterns of social organization which such institutions represented in the early nineteenth century. In education, the organizational patterns which the bureaucracy pioneered, and the pedagogical

innovations which accompanied it, completely realigned established patterns of control which served all too well the needs of the emerging industrial classes. The bureaucracy, as heralded and administered by men such as Horace Mann, can be judged on the basis of its major organization change, centralized control; and two of its most lasting pedagogical devices, the high school and the graded classroom.

As an organizational force in education, the bureaucracy represented the introduction of the principles of centralization of authority, of the privileged status of the professional, and finally, of judgement and decision-making on the basis of criteria or guidelines preestablished at a higher level. At this stage in their development, none of these principles stood unmarked by the cocoon from which they emerged. Yet, though distorted by the lingering influence of religion and fragmentation, they unquestionably transformed the conduct of education.

Each of the three basic principles could be dealt with in lengthy detail. However, the force of their impact can perhaps best be indicated by examining the beginning of the cult of professionalism and development of hierarchically administered guidelines. By creating a "profession" of education, the reformers did two things: first, they undoubtedly upgraded the quality of instruction; and second, they captured the right to define what an education was, how it should be transmitted, and ultimately, who should be eligible. Suddenly, education became a complex and difficult task which required specialized talents, and brought in a whole new bureaucracy to determine who, in fact, had those talents.

The centralization of authority in the hands of the government at the state level gave that judgement the additional weight of law. Further, these professionals, in what almost constitutes a contradiction of the assumption of their specialized knowledge, were given a set of criteria or indicators to define education. It became their task as professionals to insure the adherence to such criteria by the masses of students. This empowered a small group of centralized policy makers to establish norms that could be enforced over a large group of people; a characteristic of the most potent power of apyramidal bureaucracy; the power of few to control many. This proscription of roles, by defining educational policies and standards, regimented the activities of the classroom teacher; a role redefinition which transformed educators from creators of learning into components of a mechanical delivery system. Ironically, by depriving teachers of this ability to define their own roles, the bureaucracy made a mockery of its corresponding ethic of professionalism.

The consequences of these organizational patterns on the pedagogical style were pervasive and equally supportive of the new industrial order. Its newly acquired subtlety allowed schooling to instill social control while simultaneously facilitating the growth of capitalist innovations. It is almost ironic that men with visions of Jeffersonian democracies laid such foundations:

> School men who thought they were promoting a neutral and classless, indeed a common school education, remained unwilling to perceive the cultural bias inherent in their own writing and activity. However, the bias was central and not incidental to the standardization and administrative rational of public education. For, in the last analysis,

> the rejection of democratic localism rested only partially on its inefficiency and violation of parental prerogative. It stemmed equally from a gut fear of the cultural divisiveness inherent in the increasing religious and ethnic diversity of American Life. Cultural homogenization played counterpoint to administrative rationality. Bureaucracy was intended to standardize far more than the conduct of public life.[20]

The graded classroom, and the implementation of a core curriculum provide two examples of this ingenious combination of egalitarian rhetoric with repressive actions. To maintain legitimacy, and to fulfill the necessary function of allowing the most "talented" of the poor to arise as examples, schools needed mechanisms to lay the burden of blame on the pupils for their lack of education. The establishment of the graded classroom allowed the educators to employ their "professional expertise and uniform standards" to separate students by ability for instructional purposes.

That this separation roughly approximated class lines was, in the rhetoric of the age, a further demonstration of the superior ability of the well-to-do. Again, this reality does not negate the pedagogical rationale employed; rather the fact of social class bias confirms the distinction between the promise of education as enunciated by the reformers and the innovations they championed. As Colin Greer phrases it:

> The graded classroom was secured in principle before the Civil War. . . . It was designed to make it possible for the teacher, by keeping children of the same ability in one classroom, to teach according to their specific intellectual needs rather than to a lowest common denominator. . . Whatever the rhetoric of increased individual opportunities, there is reason to believe, although we have not believed it somehow, that the selection then as now was a reflection of social class.[21]

The graded classroom thus permitted the bureaucracy to use its legitimacy to validate previous existing social class divisions, while simultaneously providing for the gradual and controlled expansion of the educated class by permitting some working class students who wisely copied their betters to obtain the necessary certification.

The addition of the high school served much the same function. Schooling has traditionally in America been available on two levels: that which was universal, and that available to the sons and to some of the daughters of the middle and upper classes. In the nineteenth century, the existence of universal primary education validated the rhetoric of equal opportunity while the selectivity of the high school legitimized the inferiority of the poor. Both tracking and institutional selectivity have been retained as pedagogical devices and social weapons by the educational bureaucracy; their existence and function in contemporary education will be a major topic of analysis in later segments of this document.

Pedagogical Style and Cultural Modalities

At this point, the argument must be taken one further step to consider the intellectual or cultural modality which the public schools implemented. Though public education served a useful function simply in the process of legitimatizing social status, it was crucial that its products be trained to perceive and to act in a manner appropriate for that status in the new industrial order. In

other words, it was the function of the school to develop the non-cognitive attributes of worker productivity.

The radically divergent modes of production initiated in the period required labor capable of performing new tasks in a manner suited to the modality of industrialism, a modality foreign to the agrarian habits of eighteenth-century America. In what is perhaps his most powerful passage, Katz deals with the problem of time in developing societies:

> It is at the very heart of the transformation of agrarian habits, which do not emphasize precision and promptness, into habits consonant with city life and large-scale manufacture. Every society since the industrial revolution began has had to develop a mechanism for changing the behaviors appropriated in a traditional society into those called for by modernity. [22]

In rural society, labor is regulated by function: the farmer gets up with the sun and organizes his productivity by the duration of the diversified tasks he performs. Time lacks an abstract existence as a regularity principle separated from the varying rhythms of agricultural labor, a perceptual mode shared by or similar to that of independent artisans and craftsmen.

For large-scale industry, time, as defined by the standardized clock, stands as one of the central organizing principles of production. The mechanical devices of production which uniformly dictate the pace of labor, require the institution of a regular sense of time. While many innovations in technology and thus in cultural phenomena, such as the appearance of the clock as a commonplace in the home, contributed to this transformation of consciousness, the school with its stress on regimentation and its pathological

campaign against the "tardy" students (two phobias with a questionable relationship to the learning process) played a central role. Education engaged itself in the business of altering the behavior of children to bring them into strict conformity with the intellectual modalities which paralleled industrial psychology. By embracing such necessary patterns of behavior as worker punctuality, the common schools became an indispensable ally of corporate capitalism.

The organizational form and the pedagogical style institutionalized by the alliance reflected the class composition of the reformers who created and championed the innovations. Faced with the social disruption caused by rapid industrialization, the patrician class sought both to civilize and control the urban rabble and to utilize schooling under private control to return the nation to the early period. From a similar perspective, though with different goals, proletarian advocates looked to schooling to provide a means of restoring the dignity of labor and the modicum of opportunity which the old order embodied. The true innovators, the new industrial capitalists and their spokesman such as Horace Mann, were able to fashion an educational system that superficially captures the democratic rhetoric of the working class and a portion of the socializing functions advocated by the patricians. They were thus able to utilize their energies in forming a coalition that established an institution of public education which, whatever its pedagogical justifications, functioned as an indispensable tool in the development of an industrial economy. This failure to honor their stated ideals was a reflection of the inevitable contradiction between democratic ideals and the consolidation of capital under private control.

Summary

Thus the institutionalization of the public schools in the period 1820-1840 was both a reflection of and a response to the awesome expanion of the forces of production. This dialectical interaction revolved around three basic constructs: ideology, organizational structure, and pedagogical techniques. Each material base in society generated an ideology that presented a rationale for educational reform. Out of these rationales came a series of organizational structures which reflected their origins in ideology. In turn, these organizational structures, such as bureaucracy, presented a series of pedogogical styles. At each step in this development from ideology to pedigogy, the relationship of the educational position is reflected in the class interest of the advocates of that position.

Footnotes Chapter III

[1]Frank Tracy Carlton, Economic Influences Upon Educational Progress in the United States, 1820-1850 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965; originally published in 1908 by the University of Wisconsin), p. 32.

[2]Ibid., 34.

[3]Norman Ware. The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860: The Reaction of American Industrial Society to the Advance of the Industrial Revolution (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1924), p. 40.

[4]Carlton, 42.

[5]Rena L. Vassar (ed.), Social History of American Education. Vol. I: Colonial Times to 1860 (2 vols.: Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 199.

[6]Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America (New York: Praeger, 1971), quoting Henry Barnard, p. 30.

[7]Frank Tracy Carlton, Economic Influences Upon Educational Progress in the United States, 1820-1850 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), p. 44.

[8]Vassar, 199.

[9]Carlton, 88-89.

[10]Norman Ware, The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860; The Reaction of American Industrial Society to the Advance of the Industrial Revolution (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1924), p. xvi.

[11]Vassar, 235.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Arthur M. Schlessinger, Jr. The Age of Jackson (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1945), p. 510.

[15]Katz.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Katz, 15.

[18]Katz, 20.

[19]Ibid., 22.

[20]Ibid., 39.

[21]Colin Greer, The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education (New York: Basic Books, 1972), p. 72.

[22]Katz, 32.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND SOCIETY: 1910-1930

In the early twentieth century during the period that historians continue to refer to as the "age of progressivism," another wave of innovations attempted to remold American education. The mythology of schooling canonizes this period as something of a golden age. The "Great School Myth," as Colin Greer sarcastically terms it, asserts that in this period the public system built American democracy. According to the legend, schools took the backward poor, the ragged, the ill-prepared ethnic minorities that streamed into the large urban centers and "educated them." The school instilled the cognitive skills, the "reading, writing, and arithmetic," and in the process Americanized them, "molded them into the homogeneous, productive middle class that is America's strength and pride."[1]

This process of assimilation can be interpreted in a variety of fashions, each depending on the political biases of the historian. Rush Welter seizes upon the progressive concern for education and weaves the great school myth into the larger political agenda of the reformers. In his widely read Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America, Welter links this function of progressivism to the purposes of educational

reform:

> Responsive to the causes of popular protrest, but mindful of its potential aberration, progressive leaders sought to make reforms effective by introducing drastic innovations into the democratic process: the direct election of senators, the direct primary, the systematic use of expertise in the formulation of public policy . . . . Each was in some measure conceived in educational terms, intended to develop the competence as well as to increase the political power of the people to deal with contemporary evils. Far more effectively than any of their predecessors, the progressive generation identified the expansion of democracy with the expansion of education, fusing the two commitments into a comprehensive theory of politics.[2]

Within this framework the process of democratic government inherently constitutes an educational experience. As the masses develop a social and intellectual competency, "the people" begin to share in the control of governmental institutions. This faith that foreign and black people will develop those rudiments of civilization supported the illusion that progressivism might be a radical doctrine.

Unfortunately, this merger of increased knowledge with a hypothetical distribution of political power became a rationale for newer and more sophisticated utilizations of social institutions for the perpetuation of economic stratification. A second look at the distortions implicit in Welter's choice of words indicates that the objectives and tactics of the progressives were more class biased than idealistic. Similar social phenomena can be described in radically different terminology: threatened by the causes of popular protest and terrified by its ability to restructure the society, the progressive leaders sought to redirect these energies and consolidate their

power by championing modifications in the system that would simultaneously co-opt the energies of the working classes and refine governmental institutions to restore public legitimacy.

The expression of this deliberately constructed social strategy in the form of education innovation was divided into two tendencies: (1) the "educational humanists" of whom John Dewey can be seen as the unifying force; and (2) those who sought to bring efficiency to education, whose efforts can be summarized as the application of the thoughts of Frederick Olmstead Taylor to the operation of schooling. On the ideological level, Dewey's faith in openness, natural scoiability, and spontaneous selfhood appear to conflict with the application of industrial methodology to pedagogical techniques which characterize the business world is an attempt to overt control of the operation of the public schools. Yet, however real these differences, both schools of thought can be seen as parts of the larger movement to revitalize the fundamental middle-class institutions of society. While Dewey and Taylor stress competing ideologies within the bourgeoisie, both educational philosophies were constructed to sustain and support the political and economic power of the middle class.

Given this paradigm, (1) the fusing of education and politics in progressivism marks a new stage in the utilization of schooling for purposes of social control, and (2) the dichotomy between those who championed Dewey's notion of schooling, and those who more directly sought to bring

the practices of industry into the classroom, must be perceived as a disagreement in tactics rather than a fundamental class antagonism. This social analysis of progressivism does not intend to degrade or dismiss the validity of John Dewey's philosophy of education. Rather, the point is to explain from a class perspective why Dewey's ideas were accepted, and what the implications of his pedagogy were, given the economic realities of his period. To substantiate this analysis, this section will attempt to describe the ideology of middle-class reform, and then discuss its application to innovations in organizational structures and pedagogical methods.

The Middle-Class Politics of Education

Educational reformers were linked by their overt statements and unstated assumptions to the predominant social and industrial changes of their time. The turn of the century developments in the character of the population and the relationship of working people to the means of production had a pervasive impact on the middle-class individuals who joined the reform movement. The dichotomy between the tactics of Dewey and Taylor reflected a difference in attitude towards three basic developments in American capitalism:[3]

1. The establishment of the modern manufacturing corporation with its "relentless pressure towards uniformity and objectivity,"[4] and the necessity for more narrowly defined and graded hierarchical positions.

2. The changing nature of the work force brought on by the continuing decline of the small-scale production and the transition from internal migration to immigration as a major new source of manpower.
3. Increasing militancy of the working classes.

Education reflected these developments in two ways: reformers sought either to glorify this new work technology and instill its methodology, or to modify the concomitant materialism of the middle class and depravity of the poor and foreign-born. Because of the clear class perspective of the reformers who saw schools only as an extension of their factories, the social attitudes of the "humanists," and the manner in which they related to industrialism, provide a more revealing image of the patterns of interaction between politics, economics, and educational policy.

Lawrence Cremin summarizes their background in The Transformation of the School: "The reformers came to their task with the belief that the true plague of industrialism was engendered by the shattering of historic human associations, the dissolution of the fabric of community."[5] Much like their nineteenth-century predecessors, the progressives were rightly disturbed by the characteristics of urban life: poverty, inadequate housing, breakdown of family units, poor health facilities, and increasing class stratification. But the mere acknowledgment of the existence of these phenomena hardly distinguishes the progressives from either the more conservative factions of the community, or particularly from the poor themselves. The unique

features of progressivism as a movement stem from a co-existent disdain for the industrial system and for the victims of that system. These representatives of the "enlightened" wing of the middle class had no more respect for members of the urban poor than their predecessors of a half-century before.

Using their newly acquired social science jargon, the progressives were able to degrade the rebellion of the working classes by designating it deviant behavior. In part, their horror of alcohol and of prostitution was because they sensed "the rebelliousness and alienation of these forms of vice were so often an expression of. . . . . In the action of juvenile delinquents in particular they recognized a contempt for middle-class culture much deeper than their own."[6] Thus disgusted by industrialism and afraid of working-class rebellion, the progressives were faced with a choice: either they could confront the fundamental nature of the economic system, or they could attempt to modify that system while repressing its victims. Their efforts to formulate anti-filth societies to combat dirty streets and rat-infested tenements, and boy's clubs to curb the menace of street gangs to private property clearly indicate their choice of strategy. By developing a rational program of social management, the more rampant evils of urban life would be blunted. The end result of this process was the consolidation of middle-class power and the diffusion of working-class rebellion. Educational institutions played a major role in this systematized approach to political and cultural control.

The Education Agenda of the Progressives

Cremin creates, after the fact, a synopsis of the humanistic branch of progressive educational program:

> First, it meant broadening the program and function of the school to include direct concern for health and vocation, and the quality of daily and community life.
> Second, it meant applying to the classroom the pedagogic principles derived from new scientific research in psychology and social sciences.
> Third, it meant tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school. . .
> Finally, progressivism implies the radical faith that culture could be democratized without being vulgarized.[7]

If each of these innovations or ideas existed independently of their consequences in society, one could argue them on their inherent educational merits. Unfortunately, as Cremin acknowledges tacitly, these educational objectives became inextricably interwoven with the broader political agenda of their advocates. While the first decade of the twentieth century might have formed an important crucible that could have generated a major transformation in American education, the objectives of the class that sponsored the progressive reforms created inherent limitations.

Through an understanding of the similarities of this "soft" progressivism to the Taylorites, the nature of these limitations becomes apparent. The advocates of scientific managements presented quite a different program for change, though one which addressed the same symptoms and shared a difference of the cure. Ms. Pingaey outlined that program in an abstract of her well

received speech to the National Education Association in 1912 that appeared in the NEA Bulletin:

A. Purpose or object of "Scientific Management":
   1. To increase the efficiency of the laborer, i.e., the pupil.
   2. To increase the quality of the product, i.e., the pupil.
   3. Thereby to increase the amount of output and value to the capitalist.
B. Comparisons between schools and mercantile establishments:
   1. The teacher obviously corresponds to planning department, superintendent, manager of a factory.
   2. The elements in the enterprise (the workman, the raw material and the finished product) are combined in the pupil. The other elements (tools, etc.) are the text books, charts, and apparatus. . .
C. Difficulties in the way of making exact application of scientific principles:
   1. So many different elements are combined in one (i.e., the pupil).
   2. The raw material (pupil) is affected by so many outside conditions.
   3. Poor raw material cannot be exchanged for good.
   4. Teacher never sees or deals with a finished product.[8]

Arcane as such jargon might seem at this stage, scientific management received backing from powerful sources among school board members and in the popular and professional press.

As different as these two approaches appear, they represent aspects of a class's attempt to impose its will upon the world. The new psychology, the new rationalized approaches to education inherent in the progessives' utilization of psychological findings, and the idea of scientific management were the expression of a confidence generated by a century of unimpeded material and social progress. This confidence created a belief that the turmoil and conflict which had so long troubled the course of history, could at last be eliminated by means of a scientific system of control.[9] New techniques of social control

would remake the old forms of institutionalized violence; preserving, protecting, and reforming in the same gesture. It was precisely this fundamental tenet of progressivism, that the quality of a society could be judged by its ability to govern without resorting to force, that led them to a faith in the power of education.

It is Dewey who best exemplified this hope. Recognizing the destruction of the community which, for him, characterized the American tradition, he concluded that it was the function of education to reorganize those elements into a constructive environment. By making each school into a sort of embryonic community, permeated with the art, science, and history of western culture, by saturating the student with a sense of service, the school would provide, "the deepest and best guarantee of a larger society whichis worthy, lovely, and harmonious."[10] It is in this ideal sense that Dewey can be called a progressive.

Dewey's views are on one side of a strict dichotomy in the history of educational theory. His idea of the student's development from within stands in start contrast to the view that the pupil must be formed from without; and his belief that children are naturally educable contrasts with the proposition that education "is a process of overcoming natural inclination and substituting in its place habit acquired under external pressure."[11] Just as firmly as Horace Mann had hoped that education would instill the manner of industry and the veneer of civilization, Dewey used psychological arguments to demonstrate each child had a natural sociability which it was education's function to draw out. His

method was to provide in the school the correct experiences to permit the child to formulate his education.

From a social perspective, this presented Dewey with the problem of seeking new means to instill the disciplines of the cultural tradition he found so rich:

> When external control is rejected, the problem becomes that of finding the factors of control that are inherent within experience. When external authorityis rejected, it does not follow that all authority should be rejected, but rather that there is need to search for a more effective source of authority.[12]

This source was to be the more extensive personal and intimate contact between the child and the adults responsible for his socialization. Dewey hoped that by multiplying the contact between the immature child and his teachers the result would be more and increasingly effective guidance.*

In such "new schools," the adult-child interactions would focus around the experiences, or more precisely, the work tasks of the student. Dewey postulated that all individuals want an opportunity to contribute to and feel a responsibility for a community. This innate characteristic makes the primary sources of social control the very nature of the work done in a social enterprise. Out of the child's urge for natural sociability stems his individualized work

---

*It is interesting to note the position in which progressive education placed the teacher. He was to be an artist of near consummate skill, trained in pedagogy and burning with the zeal for social improvement. Given this posture, the inevitable failure of education to transcend the social condition of the children becomes the fault of the teacher, rather than the fault of the society or the educational system.

ethic and thus the guarantee of a genuine community life without the need for overt, external control.

This discovery and its implied faith in the inner man encouraged the growth of what was legitimately radical in progressivism: its rejection of external contraints upon individuals and its affirmation of the lost innocence of the inner self in a mass society. This theory of personal growth was then developed by Dewey into a general theory of social regeneration. As men and women were re-integrated with experience, they developed within themselves the sources of internal direction that led to the creation of natural communities. Thus, in Dewey's social philosophy, this rediscovery of self became not only desirable for personal reasons, but also the means of achieving far-reaching reform. Unfortunately, Dewey failed to include either a definition of or a comprehensive critique of bourgeois society in his model of learning. This omission permitted practitioners to equate the characteristics of natural sociability with the values of individualist capitalism. This failure to define radically the "natural" transformed Dewey's educational philosophy into a justification for the installation of prevailing social norms. Thus, for example, the "drawing out of spontaneous self-hood"[13] became the primary vehicle for achieving social control without force, with tragic political consequences. The source of social stability was discovered in a "reform" of the individual, rather than struggling to alter the control of industry to introduce change in the economic realities of repression.

Tracking and Testing: A Case Study in Progressivism

While neither the attempt ot make the school more "child-centered," nor the movement to introduce scientific testing have an inherent class bias, the implementation of these innovations served to make the repressive aspects of schooling more sophisticated. The introduction of the tracking system in order to orient the curriculum towards the "needs of the individual," and the support of this selection procedure by "objective measurements," provide a case study in the utilization of educational innovation to remold the school to meet the changing needs of capitalism.

Administrators and board members were faced with wide-spread dissatisfaction about the role of the high school. The standardized curriculum was unable to deal with the increasing complexity of work in an urban corporate economy, and too clumsy to differentiate between the divergent categories of students. Although the high school was established as an elite institution to provide training to the sons of white, middle-class individuals, by the turn of the century it had become more accessible to the poor, the immigrants, and increasingly, to black people. In part, this increase was necessary institutional response to a decline in the number of unskilled jobs available, a decline that forced the economy to reduce the percentage of employed young people. According to Greer, "in 1919, Chicago gave 10,000 work permits, in 1930 only 987. Between 1924 and 1930 the allocation of work permits in a number of cities was reduced by more than two-thirds."[14] Confronted with this diversification in

clientele, the school was faced with the dilemma of providing "equal opportunity," while continuing to use the high school as a mechnaism of social stratification.

Speaking in 1921 a Michigan educator hardly even bothered with the pro forma ideological justification in explaining this necessary function:

> We can picture the educational system as having a very important function as a selecting agency, as a means of selecting the men of best intelligence from the deficient and mediocre. All are poured into the system at the bottom; the incapable are soon rejected or drop out after repeating various grades and pass into the ranks of unskilled labor. . . The more intelligent who are to be clerical workers pass into the high school; the most intelligent enter the universities, there they are selected for the professions.[15]

Theoretically the school provided a rigorous and objective examination of each student on the basis of his or her intelligence, then selecting those students out at each level who failed to meet the employment qualifications implied by the approaching level of certification. In reality, the structure of the school environment discriminated against the foreign-born, poor, and black people. The consequence of this systematic racism and class bias was to mask the process of stratification in the illusion of academic competition. In this fashion, educators were able to claim that every student received an equal opportunity, while using the results of this rigged competition to stigmatize young people and assign them job status and therefore income.

Another strategy employed to reinforce class division in society with the legitimacy of schooling was the establishment of trade schools. Though aided by such generous offerings as J. P. Morgan's donation of $500,000 to New York

City, the trade school movement was consistently resisted by the growing union movements as another attempt to deprive working people of a decent chance.[16] In 1913 a bill was introduced into the Illinois legislature to establish a separate system of vocational education after the sixth grade. The bill, sponsored by Chicago Superintendent Edwin G. Cooley and vocally supported by the business community, was strongly opposed by the Chicago Federation of Labor, just as Samuel Gompers had opposed such measures nationally. They labeled the bill

> an effort on the part of large employers to turn the public schools into an agency for supplying them with an adequate supply of docile, well-trained and capable workers. . . aimed to bring Illinois a caste system of education which would shun the children of the laboring classes at an early age first into a vocational course and then into the factories.[17]

Although the labor challenge was ineffective, it sought only that the educational bureaucracy deliver on its most conservative of pledges. The unions did not ask that schooling eliminate the class division in society, only that the education equalize the opportunity for unequal rewards.

To buttress itself against these imputations and to legitimize the curious correspondence between the tracts it had established and the socio-economic level of the students' parents, educators turned once again to the increasingly scientific foundations of their profession. It is important to note that for the public school system to survive as a function of the liberal state, each of its actions had to be masked in the mantle of democracy and the freedom of the individual. For working people to accept either by force or co-optation their oppressed status, capitalism must continually provide reasons from the frame-

work of democratic, laissez-faire ideals for its educational institutions. For the tracking system to provide this support, it in turn had to be legitimatized in the propaganda vehicles supplied by university researchers and the popular press.

The educational testing movement and its objective instruments supported each of these functions by uniting the institutional character of school, life, and economic success in the individual genetic endowment. As Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis state in their essay "I. Q. and the United States Class Structure,"

> moral character, intelligence, and social worth were inextricably connected and biologically rooted. . . A glance at the new immigrant communities, the black rural ghettos, and the "breeding" of the upper classes could not but confirm this opinion in the popular mind. Statistical information came quickly from that architect of the still popular Stanford-Binet intelligence test - Lewis T. Terman - who confirmed the association of I. Q. and occupational status. Study after study moreover exhibited the lower intelligence of wards of the state and social deviants.[18]

After the turn of the century it was increasingly possible to claim scientific support in the form of objective tests adminstered and pioneered by educators for the class and racial division in America. The field of social science made it possible to claim "objectively" that those who failed in the system of public education did so because of weakness in their character and in their intelligence, rather than bias in the schools.

True to form, the progressives attempted to humanize the starkness of this objective system by providing schools with guidance counselors. Aside from acting as clerks, the ostensible function of these counselors was to tailor-

make every child's program to his or her individual needs. However, this process of selection soon became a way of channeling students into particular levels of schooling not on the basis of the child's capacity, but on the basis of the racial or class backgrounds of the parents. Again, the progressive ideology and its democratic rhetoric, i.e., treating each child as an individual, was put at the service of repression and social stratification.

Footnotes Chapter IV

[1]Greer, 3.

[2]Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), p. 246.

[3]Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis. "I.Q. in the United States Class Structure." (Harvard University, July 1972; unpublished mimeograph), p. 34.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Lawrence A. Cremin. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 60.

[6]Christopher Lasch. The New Radicalism in America: The Intellectual As A Social Type. (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 154.

[7]Cremin, viii.

[8]Raymond E. Callahan. Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961), p. 58.

[9]Lasch, 161-162.

[10]Cremin, 118.

[11]John Dewey. Experience and Education. (New York: Collier-macmillan, 1938), p. 17.

[12]Ibid., 21.

[13]Lasch, 144.

[14]Greer, p. 109.

[15]David K. Cohen and Marvin Lazerson. "Education and the Corporate Order." Socialist Revolution, Vol. 2, Number 8, No. 2 (March-April, 1972), p. 50.

[16]Cremin, 36.

[17]Jerome Karabel. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, No. 4 (November, 1972), p. 550.

[18]Bowles, 33.

PART III

CONTEMPORARY INNOVATION

CHAPTER V

ORIGIN OF CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

As the pastoral social descriptions generated by post-war American ideology disintegrated under sordid facts of racist and imperialist violence, it became normative, almost uniform, for anyone connected with public education to lament the crisis which threatened their school. By the force of sheer volume and frequency, in additon to the added impetus of the political affiliations of those questioning educational structures, these critics have succeeded in the establishment of a new orthodoxy. It is important to gain a perspective on these new educational ideas by examining the origins of the popular conception of the "crisis in education," and the political theory which supports current definitions of innovative education.

A textual examination of Charles Silberman's book, Crisis in the Classroom, provides an excellent vehicle for the exploration for these two themes; useful because of the clarity of his ideological biases and because of the wide range of support which his work has elicited. It is indeed rare when a publication of a foundation study becomes front-page news in numerous major newspapers, particularly when the criticisms broached are hardly new or original. The publication of Crisis in the Classroom had been preceded by the appearance of the writings of James Herndon, Malcolm X, Jonothan Kozol, Joseph Featherstone, Edgar Friedenberg, etc.; in addition to the unwavering, though "unscholarly" protests by Third World and low-income whites, protests conveniently ignored

or distorted by the capitalist media. Thus, the popularity of the book hardly results from a marked departure in available knowledge about schools. In fact his position represents a regression of more direct and trenchant attacks made by parents whose children had fallen victim to compulsory schooling. Rather, the acclaim which greeted Crisis in the Classroom stems from the subtle alteration by Silberman of the context of these criticisms, and of the corresponding shift in the ideology which these alterations represent.

The educational systems' inability to facilitate the economic mobility which it had traditionally promised has long been evident. Large urban systems have traditionally created schools which serviced segments of the population according to their societal status. To perpetuate existing levels of stratification Third World men and women were traditionally treated as a colonial population just as low-income whites were conditioned to accept skills appropriate to "working people." Vast differentials could be readily observed between the educational attainments of different races and different income groups within urban school systems: 31 per cent of the children who completed ninth grade in major metropolitan areas failed to receive their high school diplomas, against 24 per cent nationally. In one city, the rate of unemployment for male school-leavers sixteen to twenty-one is fifteen times higher than the rate for high school graduates - and in the same city, 48 per cent of boys sixteen to twenty-one years old with high school diplomas were unemployed.[1] Suburban areas have achieved a certain uniformity by enforcing minimum levels of income, prohibitive housing costs, restrictive covenants, and banking regulations.

Regardless of such prevailing ideological explanations of this educational stratification as "the culture of poverty," it was clear that the schools were failing on a massive level to fulfill their obligations to a bourgeois, or a Jeffersonian democracy.

Slowly, as the civil rights movement increased in scope, attention focused on what was condescendingly described as "the plight of black children." Numerous poignantly written accounts by white liberals (Holt, Kohl, Kozol) fostered a concern in segmentsof the white population over the quality of education for black children. It is crucial to note that better, or at least equivalent statements (e.g., Carter Woodson) made by black writers had no effect on the white population. Out of this increased consciousness developed a certain limited, at least rhetorical, support among white liberals for "desegregation efforts," or "compensatory education." Such verbal advocacy was made possible by two assumptions: (1) integration implied the absorption of a limited number of black people into the current societal order; and (2) that the schools white children attended represented an acceptable standard of attainment. A further unstated though firm stipulation for white support was that tactical decisions maintain the "lawful" and "orderly nature of the movement." Thus, the preconditions of desegregation and compensatory education insured that they would never seriously threaten either the popular image of education which white people received, or the governmental processes bywhich wealthy white people ruled.

Such a movement failed to create a sense of "crisis" for two reasons. First, in a racist society such as ours, the new realization that vast numbers of Third World children were being debilitated by the schooling process was not, in itself, threatening to the white majority, particularly low-income whites who had been indoctrinated to believe that Third World people must inherently represent a threat to their social and economic status. Ingrained patterns of thought translated this failure to take advantage of the opportunities offered as further demonstration of the inferiority of blacks; or, yet another instance of the oppressed's lack of gratitude for the efforts of a "great society." In other words, the miseducation of black and Spanish-speaking people and the inferior education of low-income whites as a fact in itself hardly represents a crisis.

Secondly, general dissatisfaction with the quality of education was acceptable to a large segment of the middle-classes as long as such dissatisfaction failed to generate political actions which could threaten their grasp on wealth and power. Members of what C. Wright Mills termed the power elite, received numerous benefits from schools which executed a genocidal policy; but, if such schools failed to inculcate docility, or at least a prohibitive fear of the legal mechanism of the society, those in power ran the risk that a political consciousness might transform this dissatisfaction into revolutionary or disruptive activity. Stated bluntly, as the responses to genocide failed to threaten white power, the existence of schools which fail to promote cognitive, affective or economic development reflected a successful policy rather than a crisis situation.

Given this context, the wide-spread acceptance of Silberman's book must be seen as reflecting an alteration in white America's perception of the current status of public education. Given that the actual conditions in education had not significantly deteriorated in oppressed communities below prior "acceptable levels," the creating of a sense of crisis in the middle-class press can be related to three viables which did change: the inclusion of the white, bourgeois schools in the crisis area, the increasing militancy of the Third World community and the threat to the economic order it represents, and finally, the combination of the above two facts to undermine the legitimacy of the public education bureaucracy.

On one level, Silberman challenges the assumption that the education which white children received was adequate. Instead of ignoring what "urban" schools were doing to other people's children, middle-class parents were forced to re-evaluate their smug belief in the quality of the friendly, neighborhood school. The motive force for this re-evaluation grew, in part, from the increasing hostility of white children to the bureaucracy that structured their lives until the age of eighteen. Thus, Silberman created an acceptance of the label "crisis" by including the schooling of white people in his definition.

This segment of the population was also forced into an acceptance of the work "crisis" by the political mobilization of the black community. Though the schools had been created to serve their social function of indoctrination and pacification, they helped to develop a class which engaged both street violence

and revolutionary activity. What white America found objectionable in this situation was not the genocidal nature of the schools, but the emerging revolutionary activism of black people. In other words, the "crisis" was defined not as the failure of education to satisfy needs as defined by communities, but the failure of education to serve the interests of that monopoly capital had in the manipulation of the black population and low-income white population. The above does not imply that the Carnegie report consciously capitalized on or even advocated the social thinking delineated above; only that such alterations in political activities created the conditions upon which the wide-spread acceptance of that report rested.

On another level, the basic public legitimacy of the institution was threatened by the scope of criticism. Liberal apologists had long proclaimed the equality of opportunity under capitalism, an equality which was made possible by the quality of schooling provided to poor people. Education delivered the skills which students absorbed according to the extent of their intelligence, then entered the market place to be judged on the basis of their performance. Or as John Gardner phrased it:

> It must never be forgotten that ours is one of the few societies in the history of the world, in which performance is the primary determinant of status. What the individual can 'deliver' in the way of performance is a major factor in how far he can rise in the world.[2]

This mythology of the "meritocracy" is crucial in the repression of the working class and national minorities, because it places the blame for the unequal

division of rewards firmly on the victims of systematic exclusion: poverty is a result of poor performance caused by cultural, moral or intellectual deprivation. Further, in the day-to-day activities of production, it is necessary for workers to respect the controlling forces exercised by their superiors who, in turn, must justify to themselves their own authority over other working people.[3] The decline in the legitimacy of the public schools, by revealing the illegitimate advantages of the middle classes, undermined the basic legitimacy of the distribution of wealth under capitalism.

To the managers of education, those in the government responsible for the formulation of public policy, a number of indicators combined to demonstrate the declining levels of public acceptance of schooling; among them, the level of violence directed to the schools themselves, and general recognition of the growing black "lumpen" proletariat. Though not overtly ideological, the level of violence directed at the physical embodiment of schooling, the institutions themselves, gives some indication of the extent of public estrangement. In New York City, the costs to the system to repair deliberate glass breakage escalated from $481,782 in 1959 to $1,241,480 in 1971, while the total costs of calculable damage mushroomed from $601,019 to $3,691,616. These figures do not include an almost equal amount of damage incurred by the defacement of desks, walls, and the destruction of furniture and other small items.[4] More astute planners could not help but wonder when the violent fruits of such alienation would turn directly against places of work as the concrete manifestation of economic in-

justice; and the gradual rise in deliberate industrial sabotage could only confirm these fears.

Equally disturbing was the development of what Lyndon B. Johnson's Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, termed the human scrap heap, a mass of useless individuals growing at a rate of 250,000 to 500, 000 a year. He defined the scrap heap as being composed of:

> Persons who, as a consequence of technological development, of their own educational failures, of environments of poverty and other causes that disqualify them for employment in a skilled economy, cannot and will not find work without special help.[5]

Commenting on this speech, Samuel Yette adds:

> Once an economic asset, they are not considered an economic drap. The wood is all hewn, the water all drawn, the cotton all picked, and the rails reach from coast to coast. The ditches are all dug, the dishes are put away, and only a few shoes remained to be shined.[6]

From this fact, Yette can only draw one conclusion: America is faced with the question of engaging in an overtly genocidal action to disperse this predominantly black "lumpen." The existence of such a question and its serious discussion, placing aside the obvious threat to property inherent on such a group, further undermined the legitimacy of the state. One could not observe the existence of a human scrap heap and, at the same time, believe in the school as an equalizer of economic opportunity: Wirtz's concluding plea in the speech quoted above was for the institutions of America to help in the task of turning this "garbage" into material for richer progress. In doing so, he indicated the basic line of reasoning of the educational reformers. Crudely summarized, he was asking

that the basic economic institutions of capitalism, whose basic function is exploitation, to develop a more subtle strategy. The existence of the scrap heap is too blatant; the theme of liberal reform suggests that the function of repression be conducted under the guise of welfare, education and other dependency programs rather than overt genocide. Thus the educational crisis became a reality to dominant society, not because of the inherent characteristics of the educational system itself, or its complete inability to meet the needs of oppressed peoples; rather, the crisis was created by the realization that current educational practices did not serve the needs of the political forces which controlled education. This alteration in perception was created by the observation that the education system was not meeting the needs of the children of those who held power; and that the schools were increasingly ineffective in pacifying the children of the victims of capitalist, economic, and social policies.

The second major ideological theme which made Crisis in the Classroom so acceptable to the mainstream of American educational thinking was the political motivation which the work attributed to those who perpetrated oppression and its ensuing strategy for change. After taking numerous "cheap shots" at a commonly accepted scapegoat, television, Silberman defines the "origin" of our educational inadequacies:

> What is mostly wrong with television, newspapers, magazines and films is what is mostly wrong with the schools and colleges: mindlessness. At the heart of the problem, that is to say, is the failure of people at every level to ask why they are doing what they are doing or to inquire into the consequences.[7]

This statement is worthy of analysis, not so much because it is Silberman's, but because it reflects an underlying assumption held by educational professionals. The position, translated into a concrete application, implies that teachers fail to see the distructive consequences of their institutions, and that the doctors, lawyers, politicians, and businessmen on the lay boards which direct those schools sincerely believe that they are providing a legitimate service.

This common definition of the heart of the problem engenders a particular strategy for change: "the solution must lie in infusing the various educating institutions with purpose, more important, with thought about purpose."[8] Therefore, the dissemination of information creates the foundation for the "new revolution in American education":

> We must find ways of stimulating educators - public school teachers, principals, and superintendents; college professors, deans, and presidents; radio, television and film directors and producers; newspapers, magazine and TV journalists and executives - to think about what they are doing and why they are doing it. And we must persuade the general public to do the same.[9]

In essence, this new line of reformers promised that change could come to education without altering any of the structural determinants of power in the public bureaucracy. The unions, the certifying agencies, the teacher training institutions, the school boards, the publishing companies, and other constituencies could retain their strangle hold, and simultaneously be stimulated to operate their respective fiefdoms in "new and innovative" ways. In other words, the educational liberals advocate a plan for change that is a strategy for the retention of power in vested interests.

The myopic liberalism which characterizes the position of the educational innovators typifies the vacuity of American political ideology and in itself creates a major impediment to change. Contrary to such assertions, public education has not failed to exercise its societal function. In a highly differentiated capitalist economy such as ours, a wide variety of individuals are needed to fulfill the rigidly defined economic roles. For example, a city such as New York needs a certain number of busboys, cab drivers, garbage men, clerks, in addition to the bureaucratic drones who staff the major corporate offices and the white elite who run them. One of the social functions of the schools is to produce men and women capable of functioning "efficiently" in each of these roles, each with a distinctive psychological characteristic.

Given this perspective, the structure of schools assumes a less random or benign derivation. How does a society attempt to transform a spirit as strong and beautiful as that of the child into the broken mind of a man or woman forced to accept labor which degrades his or her possibilities? How does a society train the varied emotions of a child to accept the unending trivia and uniformity of the corporate bureaucracy. While a number of institutions, such as the family, contribute to this process, schools play a vital role. Blessedly, such efforts do not always succeed, but that miracle should not obscure the systematic nature of the attempt:

> Infusing the schools with corporate values and reorganizing them in ways seen as consistent with this new economic order has been the dominant motif. Education has been closely tied to production - schooling has been justified as a way of increasing wealth, of improving industrial output, and of making management more effective. The

> schools' role has been to socialize economically desirable values and behavior, teach vocational skills, and provide education consistent with students' expected occupational attainment. As a result, the schools' culture became closely identified with the ethos of the corporate work place.[10]

In that environment, teachers can, in the name of the processes of education and civilization, warp, bend and forcibly degrade children into accepting conceptions of themselves that suit them to their prospective economic role. In order to train a worker to stand dumbly in front of a steam press eight hours a day, society sends him to an American high school where he is systematically taught to accept boredom, to accept a complete lack of control over his fate.

Thus, the "failure" of America's schools is hardly one of mindlessness on the part of those who control them. The New York City Board of Education must observe the discrepancy between the goals they endorse and the policy they propagate. They see that data that demonstrates that the vast majority of the city's high school graduates are functional illiterates; that each year a child receives an education, his or her I.Q. declines; and that in 1972 the average grade school child read below the average level of 1971. To be cognizant of these facts, and yet to fail to accept the radical reforms necessary to create a viable educational system, indicates that the Board of Education and the elite which it represents hold the vested political and economic interests of the bourgeoise to be of a higher priority than the educational rhetoric they espouse.

In summary, a more accurate definition of the crisis in urban education, or the "failure" which the reforms are attempting to correct, is the inability of

the schools to provide the necessary support services for the social and economic system. On one level, schools are failing to provide the sons and daughters of the well-to-do with the tools and the attitudes which funnel them into their positions in the agencies of control and implementation. On another, the schools have become so fraudulent that they are unable to pacify oppressed people with the illusion that they too have been given, and lost, their chance at economic advancement. This failure at pacification leads to the failure to accept the fact of exploitation in the market place, the fundamental necessity of the perpetuation of capitalism. Finally, this term crisis was acceptable because its definition endangers a strategy for change that allowed for the perpetuation of power in vested interests, a model for educational change which can only produce a change in the tactics of oppression instead of alleviation of oppression itself.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Colin Greer, The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education (New York: Basic Books, 1972), p. 27.

[2]John W. Gardner, Excellence. Can we be Equal and Excellent Too? (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 79.

[3]Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "I.Q. in the United States Class Structure," (Harvard University: July, 1972; unpublished mimeograph).

[4]City of New York, Board of Education, Office of School Buildings, Division of Maintenance and Operation, Bureau of Plant Operation, Estimated Costs of Vandalism, 1969-1972.

[5]Samuel F. Yette, The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America (New York: Medaillon, 1971), p. 13.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 36.

[8]Ibid., 11.

[9]Ibid.

[10]David K. Cohen and Marvin Lazerson, "Education and the Corporate Order," Socialist Revolution, Vol. 2, Number 8, No. 2 (March-April, 1972), pp. 47-72.

CHAPTER VI

THE FAILURE OF LIBERAL REFORM

In the post-war period, liberals attempted a series of specific reforms to support the legitimacy of the educational bureaucracy. The ostensible purpose of these thrusts was to equalize educational opportunity, and thereby begin to introduce overall equality into the society. Christopher Jencks summarizes this public policy in three propositions:

1. Eliminating poverty is largely a matter of helping children born into poverty rise out of it.

2. The primary reasons poor children do not escape from poverty is that they do not acquire basic cognitive skills. They can not read, write, etc.

3. The best mechanism for breaking this vicious cycle is educational reform.[1]

Utilizing the argument first legimized in the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education Supreme Court decision of 1954, the liberals claimed that the school must be a tool to equalize the effects of different family, racial, and economic backgrounds. It was not enough for children to be exposed to the same curriculum, have an equal amount of money expended per pupil, or to equalize teachers' salaries, and physical plants: the criteria of judgment must be the effect of schooling, as calculated by statistical norms, on the relationship of a child's

ascriptive characteristics to his ultimate socio-economic status.[2]

This effort, no matter how well intentioned, was guaranteed to fail by the racial and class biases of its strategies, and the generally fraudulent methodology of the means themselves. This section will analyze, in varying degrees of detail, five basic strategies for intervention: desegregation, model sub-systems, parallel systems, total system reform, and compensatory education.[3] The purpose will be to understand in each instance (1) the value of the strategy for oppressed people, (2) the benefit of the strategy for the ruling oligarchy of this country, and (3) to determine the inherent limitations of educational reform as an instrument of liberal social policy.

Desegragation*

Arguments in favor of enforcing desegregation were based on a contact theory of learning and prejudice. It was assumed that black children would be exposed to greater resources, and therefore receive a better education, if they went to school with white children. It was also assumed that the quantity of contact between black and white children would lead to greater mutual awareness which, would, in turn diminish racial prejudice. Much of the political furor which surrounded education in the fifties and sixties was caused by the efforts of an interracial coalition to test out these assumptions in the public school system. While no parent should be prohibited by the state from sending

---

*For the purpose of this discussion, we will deal only with northern school desegregation.

a child to the best possible school, the massive attempt to increase educational opportunity through desegregation of the schools has proved to be a politically unfeasible and an educationally fraudulent strategy.

The notion of desegregation first came under attack from the Coleman Report, the fruit of a massive Federal research effort launched to prove the inherent value of interracial education. The document, termed the Equality of Educational Opportunity Report, asserted that school resources had little to do with academic achievement, a variable which in their study correlated more directly with home, neighborhood and peer environments. Thus, the mere transfer of a child from one institution to another would have little effect on statistical predictions for cognitive achievement.

More recently, data drawn from the highly publicized desegregation efforts - White Plains, Ann Arbor, Riverside, Project Concern, A Better Chance, and METCO - further question the supposed relationship between integration and quality education. The data, as analyzed in the Armor Report, suggests five conclusions:[4]

1. That it is impossible to demonstrate conclusively that integration has an appreciable effect on the academic achievement of black or white children as measured by standardized tests;

2. That integration does not lead to an increase in levels of educational or occupational aspiration levels for bused students; in fact, evidence indicates a significant decline;

3. That integration, particularly brought about by busing, has the effect of heightening racial antagonism, and promotes separatist ideologies in the white and black communities;

4. That in terms of long term educational achievement, the only demonstrable change was a channelling effect increasing the number of black students who entered college, a fact that suggests only that colleges prefer to accept black students certified as "safe" by their successful matriculation from white institutions. Though each of these studies has been issued to serve a variety of questionable political agendas, and slowly refuted by the proponents of integration within the academic community, the net effect is to cast doubt on the educational benefit of school integration as it is currently practiced for minority students and children.

The root causes of the educational failure of the desegregation effort stems from the basic political and cultural motivations which fostered the support for integration within the white community. As practiced, desegregation meant moving Third World children into white schools to facilitate their assimilation into the value structure of white America. Integration was rarely seen as the bringing together of two cultures, but as the blending of the minority into the majority. Supposedly, the curriculum would provide a vehicle for this process of homogenization. Thus the "desegregation of the curriculum" meant the addition of Martin Luther King to the list of historical figures, but not the purging of such mythology as the founding of America by Christopher Columbus and other vestiges of "white" history. It was this faith in the power of the schools

to assimilate diversity that promoted desegregation as a strategy within the dominant society, and simultaneously precipitated failure as an educational remedy. For even if Coleman and Jencks are mistaken and schooling can significantly influence achievement, antagonism generated by this attempt at cultural genocide precluded any openness to learning.

The example reflects one of the basic weaknesses of the desegregation strategy: its inability to challenge the patterns of economic oppression practiced by the schools, and the mechanism used by educational professionals to socialize black and white children. The advocacy of desegregation directed the political spotlight away from fundamental questions about the function of schooling and the inherent racist characteristic of the education given to white and black people in separate or in integrated classrooms. Thus, while desegregation was a reform movement, i.e., it did challenge certain assumptions and was therefore of limited value, it simultaneously laid the groundwork for another phase in the utilization of schooling for social control. Finally, desegregation is not only of questionable merit, but basic demographic patterns also remove it as a viable option in most urban cities. While the right of children to attend schools regardless of race must be continually asserted, desegregation has proved for educational and political reasons to be a totally unproductive strategy.

Model Subsystem

Though they have largely passed from the scene, experimental subsystems such as the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Demonstration Unit and the Adams Morgan Community School were portrayed by their advocates as serious attempts by educators to improve teacher training, curriculum, instructional methodologies, and to alter the control by public education by inviting community participation in a variety of functions and capacities. As it is impossible to evaluate these efforts on the same scale as desegregation because of their short and unstable political lives, one can try to only explain why they failed to make a substantial impact.

In a very real sense, these supposedly experimental units never differed very radically from their parent systems. Though each was given a certain degree of autonomy, or pseudo power, the subsystem was bound by the same determining factors. Taking Ocean Hill as an example, the supposedly experimental district under "parent control" was forced to operate with the same restrictive union contracts, teachers, textbooks, civil service regulations, and threatened by the same fiscal constraints as conventional districts. Obviously, compliance with these bureaucratic regulations minimized the ability of the experiment to differentiate itself in any significant way from the institutionalized failure of conventional models.

The parents and administrators attempt to take seriously the rhetoric and create a legitimate alternative provided the justification for the destruction

of the demonstration unit itself. The violence and finality of the dismemberment of Ocean Hill is proof of the assertion that the district was never meant to create a legitimate alternative.

Taking the rhetorical purpose of the district seriously implied to the parents a frontal attack on the established powers who control schooling in New York City: the union, the school board, the state and local interests which rule through such vehicles as civil service. Clearly, the demonstration district was not intended by any of its initiators, with the possible exception of the Ford Foundation, to serve that function.

What, then, did the vested interests who originally supported the concept of Ocean Hill, such as the liberal wing of the U. F. T. and the Central Board, have to gain by propagating this sham? While one can only speculate, inference confirms two basic lines of reasoning: first, by focusing reform efforts onto two or three very small projects which were structured so as not to succeed, the forms of attack by militant reformers would be deflected from the central institution and ultimately discredited. Secondly, the bureaucracy faced a crisis of legitimacy, particularly in areas dominated by the Third World community. Thus it was their hope that by infusing larger numbers of minority people into the educational bureaucracy, the direct colonial tactics of the board could be supplanted by neo-colonial oppression, i.e., that significant numbers of Third World people could be co-opted into the more exposed, though powerless, positions in the institutions of discrimination. Given this strategy, when the demonstration units developed into a cancer infecting the whole, and the

community boards became the legitimate representatives of their constituency, the experiment no longer served its original function and, therefore, had to be destroyed.

Parallel Systems

This movement to establish free or alternative schools has, in some ways, had an impact on the conduct of schooling. On one hand, the existence of, or at least the mythology which surrounds, an institution such as Harlem Prep, presented a clear challenge to the public schools; while the "free schools" operated generally by white, middle-class radicals have shown ways to humanize the classroom. Also, the few parent-run and operated schools in the black and white communities do present substantial examples of the contribution schooling can make to the struggle for liberation.

However, as a major force, the alternative institutions have not become a serious threat to the public bureaucracy due to a variety of problems, some inevitable, some caused by the failing of the advocates of free schools. Alternative schools have too often become an excuse for idealistic whites to act out their personal rebellion using children as a prop, a process which often fails to provide the skills necessary for the students themselves to work for liberation. The romantic pursuit of macrame, pottery, and ecology in the "open classroom" does little to contribute to the political struggle. Those schools which have avoided such pitfalls and created a powerful and political educational experience have been hampered by the lack of alternative funding

sources and public acceptability. The steps necessary to breath life into the movement, such as a legitimate voucher plan, have been stifled or distorted by the same coalition of forces which blocked the experimental units within the public system.

Total System Reform

The preceding lists of evasions and subterfuges utilized to perpetrate the illusion of educational reform without altering in essence the conduct of schooling, or the powers that control its formal institution almost make any discussion of the broader, system-wide efforts, a mockery. Yet, it remains important to examine this charade to continue to expose the weakness of the liberal strategy and its political impotency. Passing over the elaborately constructed political extravaganzas which surrounded systemic reform of the public schools, such as the Passow Report on the District of Columbia Schools and the Bundy Report on Decentralization, this section will look at two specific examples of system-wide reform: the attempt to reform the financing of education, and the attempt to correct the imperfections of secondary schooling through open access to higher education.

Encouraged by the success of the Serrano case in the lower courts, strategists hope that by the elimination of the property tax as the main form of supporting public education, an equality of finance will lead to an overall equalization in the effect of schooling. It is doubtful that the effect of state-wide equity of finance will have such an impact due to the weak correlation between

fiscal input and educational output, and the numerous riders to fiscal redistribution, such as those proposed in the Fleischman Report. Thus, while the attempts to place the financing of education on a state-wide basis will alleviate the more drastic differentials in expenditures, this should have little relation to classroom behavior.

Further, the basic approach outlined in Serrano ignores the economic realities of fiscal control and the consequences of that control for urban education. The causes of the expenditure gap stem from the effect of trends in urban economics on public education. Less money is currently available because of the combination of a declining fiscal situation with the rising demand for other services. This makes it increasingly difficult for educators to get access to tax resources. Once resources are secured, cost factors are higher, and the high overhead and legal requirements which characterized urban areas lessen the pedagogical impact of available resources. These impediments on the expenditures of funds secured are reflective of larger economic and demographic trends:

> A sorting out of process has occurred - leaving the poor, under-educated, aged and non-white in the central cities and taking heavy manufacturing, many retail establishments and other kinds of business activities to the suburbs along with middle and upper income families. The result is that the tax base of cities has become insufficient to meet the resource need of the high cost city population.[5]

In crude statistics, between 1958 and 1967 in the thirty-seven largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, suburban retail sales increased at a real rate

of 106 per cent, central city sales by only 13 per cent, with a corresponding decline in the central city share of metropolitan retail sales from 63 per cent in 1958 to 54 per cent in 1963 to 49 per cent in 1967.[6] The power of tax revenues generated by sales have moved in the post-war years from urban to suburban centers.

Thus, as cities become increasingly segregated by race and by class, they will become increasingly dependent upon the predominantly white and middle-class suburban and rural population for fiscal resources. Harbingers of the future such as Newark indicate that Third World political control, no matter how moderate, can be threatened by the gradual bankruptcy of the city and its literal absorption into large, racist controlled legislatures. Such trends make a mockery of hopes that educational reform to achieve state-wide finance will increase the quality of teaching. No structural reform in patterns of distribution can alter the basic influence of the power generated by economic control of the means of production.

Results are also sought from alteration in the determination of who goes to school, and for how long. Certainly, one of the major structural changes in public education has been the extension of the average time in school:

> In the 1920's about 40 per cent of the population finished high school, just under 20 per cent entered college, just under 10 per cent finished college, and just under 5 per cent did some kind of graduate work. Today, 80 per cent graduate from high school, almost 40 per cent enter some kind of college, almost 20 per cent graduate, and almost 10 per cent do some kind of graduate work.[7]

The vast majority of these increases in the post-secondary level have been absorbed into the community colleges. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, community colleges enrolled 153,970 in 1948, developed to over a million in twenty years to 1,169,635 in 1968. The corresponding growth in the number of institutions during the sixties was from 656 to 1,100.[8] This mushrooming development is portrayed as illustrating the increasing democratization of higher education. This open access is often portrayed as a means to moderate the inequality generated by secondary education.

However valid these entrance statistics, they do not necessarily demonstrate any relationship between the growth of the community colleges and an equalization of access to either marketable skills or future income. In fact, as Jerome Karable documented in his essay "Community College and Social Stratification," two-year institutions have reinforced the high school as yet another mechanism of educational discrimination. Using data generated by the California state system, the most advanced system of state-supported higher education in the country, Karable demonstrates an inverse relation between attendance at a community college and the percentage of college degrees by population. The open door becomes in practice a "revolving door":

> The community college movement fulfills the traditional American quest for equality of opportunity without sacrificing the principle of achievement. On the one hand, the openness of the community college gives testimony to the American commitment to equality of opportunity through education. . . On the other hand, the community college leaves the principle of achievement intact by enabling the state colleges and universities to deny access to those citizens who do not meet their qualifications.[9]

The latent ideology is that everyone should have an opportunity, but that once low-income students demonstrate their lack of skills or cultural background, an unequal distribution of education and economic rewards is acceptable. Thus, structural reform in post-secondary education becomes a vehicle to perpetuate liberal myths about schooling while channeling working-class and Third World students into the semi-professions such as data processing and health technology. In the long tradition of American education, total system reform becomes a vehicle to refine the system to meet the new and additional needs of the economy while preserving and supporting the legitimacy of unequal distribution of goods under capitalism.

Compensatory Education

The massive effort conducted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides a vehicle for the examination of compensatory education. The failure of Title I also indirectly exposes the process of federal aid to education and the inherent racial and class position of remedial programs. Taking the nation as a whole, federal aid constitutes less than seven per cent of public elementary and secondary revenues. For the five industrialized states - California, New York, Michigan, Massachusetts and Texas - federal aid on a per pupil basis averaged between $22 and $50 dollars per pupil.[10] Given the minimal effect that can be generated by such marginal increments, Title I supposedly represented an attempt to concentrate the federal dollar in raising the achievement levels of poor children. Under the stimulation

of the Title, districts were allocated grants on the basis of the number of eligible children on the condition that funds received would go towards providing additional educational programs to children already receiving comparable services. The underlying assumption was that these supplemental activities, operated by the same professionals who had previously been unable to bring poor children up to grade level, would somehow help to off-set the deprived backgrounds of the students.

Title I has been unable even to attempt to implement this rather questionable set of assumptions. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund reported that:

> although Title I is not general aid to education but categorical aid to children from poor families who have education handicaps, funds appropriated under the Act are being used for general school purposes: to initiate system-wide programs; to buy books and supplies for all school children in the system; to pay general overhead and operating expenses; to meet new teacher contracts and operating expenses; to meet new teacher contracts which call for higher salaries; to purchase all-purpose school facilities; and to equip superintendents' offices with panelling, wall-to-wall carpeting and color television.[11]

The violations listed above are normative rather than exceptional. Title I funds were issued on the guarantee by a school district of comparability of Title I and non-Title I schools, comparability being defined by the United States Office of Education to mean that per pupil expenditures and services procured from state and local revenues must generally be equal among all schools within a school district prior to the application of Title I funds. In 1971, in data submitted to the Office of Education, of all school districts reporting:

29% lacked comparability in the number of pupils per teacher;
42% lacked comparability in the number of pupils per other insti instructional staff;
47% lacked comparability in the number of pupils per non-certified instructional staff;
34% lacked comparability in expenditures per pupil for instructional salaries.[12]

Though in possession of data clearly proving fraudulent utilization of federal funds, the Office of Education has neither the capability nor the desire to enforce the legislation.

Undoubtedly the major beneficiaries of this "poverty" program were the middle=class bureaucrats who managed it, and the educational components of major corporations, such as the Science Research Associates-International Business Machines combine. In the fiscal year 1965, prior to the passage of Title I, the budget of the Office of Education was $954,000 of which $115,150,000 went to major industrialists; after Title I, the Office of Education budget doubled to $1,972,000.00, while the share for the corporations quadrupled to $522,130,000.[13] Saving the poor from the effects of exploitation had become a profitable business.

Commentators have attempted to identify a number of causes for this fraud: the fact that the drafters of the legislation were not the implementors, that the Office of Education was understaffed and lacked a desire to monitor, that law and traditions favored local control, and the difficulty of arousing public opinion around an issue clouded by obscure formulas for distribution.[14] Each of these shortcomings does to a certain extent explain the overall failure of Title I to effect the education of poor children, while certainly underscoring

the inability of the federal government to sponsor educational reform on a broad scale. But the simple delineation of the characteristics of the administration of compensatory education does not develop a causal relationship between those characteristics and their source. Nor does this line of reasoning explain why, of all the intervention strategies available, compensatory education provided the most attractive alternative to the education policy-makers in the federal government. The assumptions and practices of the educational programs conducted by intervention programs themselves provides answers to these questions.

Using sociological and educational methods, compensatory education attempted to intervene in the developmental process of poor and predominantly black children. The underlying argument assumed that by "enriching" the child's environment and "improving" his language and cognitive skills, the child would be able to function in a standard educational system. Stated simply, compensatory education would, by intensifying and expanding operative procedures of the schools, deal with the depravity of the learner.

This strategy is, at best, unrealistic given current linguistic and anthropological data and, at worst, class based and inherently racist. As Joan and Stephen Baratz point out in their article "Early Childhood Intervention: the Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," the argument assumes that to be different from middle-class whites is to be inferior, and that there exists no such entity as "Negro culture."[15] This argument at its worst is exemplified

in the work of Daniel P. Moynihan. With his penchant for cruedly stated racism, he writes in Beyond the Melting Pot:

> There is little question where the major part of the answer must be found: in the home and family and community - not in its overt values, which as we have seen are positive in relation to education, but in its conditions and circumstances. It is there that the heritage of two hundred years of slavery and a hundred years of discrimination is concentrated; and it is there that we find the serious obstacles to the ability to make use of a free educational system to advance into higher occupations and to eliminate the massive social problems that afflict colored Americans in the City.[16]

He argues that because of a heritage of oppression, the blame for failure lies in the depravity of black people. Thus, if one makes available the bountiful culture of the white middle-class, black children will learn to read, and the mythology of education supplying the ladder to economic gain is confirmed again.

The payoffs from this tactic to the educational system and the powers it represents are many. First of all, the school system is left blameless; in fact, its failure to teach only becomes one more reason to pump more and more money into the public schools. On a second level, education becomes defined as the ability to operate within the cognitive models established by white middle-class culture. To think, talk, or write differently is to be deprived. Thus the strategy of compensatory education becomes one of intensifying the instrument of educational oppression to increase the level of achievement of oppressed people.

When this strategy failed to measurably effect achievement, not to

mention effecting the "social ills" Moynihan bemoans, liberal educators were facted with a curious dilemma: why did their teaching fail to raise the I. Q. of black children? While some did confront the validity of their profession, another explanation was presented by such pseudo-scientists as Arthur Jensen and Richard Hernstein: genetic inferiority. The failure of intervention programs was explained not by the weak educational methods or the depravity of culture, but in the inherent intellectual inferiority of black people. At this point it is senseless to re-enter the endless debate which surrounds Jensen's publications. It is only necessary to note the utilization of the fatal combination of racism and pseudo-social science to obfiscate the basic fact of the linkage between the nature and the structure of schooling and the oppressive nature of society.

As the Baratz article states, the argument for compensatory education and the rationalizations of its failure, are doomed by the inherent racism of their proponents. As they clearly state,

> black children are neither linguistically impoverished nor cognitively underdeveloped. Although their language system is different and therefore presents a handicap to the children attempting to negotiate with standard English-speaking mainstream, it is nonetheless a fully developed, highly structured system that is more than adequate for aiding in abstract thinking.[17]

The consequence of the inability to perceive Black-Language and Third World cultures as independent and intact entities was the definition of educability as the acquisition of specific middle-class mainstream behaviors rather than the development of the universal process of intellectual development described by Piaget. Poor and black children are a priori inadequate because they are not

middle class. Thus, compensatory education was guaranteed to fail because of its demands that a child perform according to the norms of an alien and hostile culture.[18] What was billed as a reform in education designed to benefit the poor becomes in essence a method to pay off practitioners with no record of success to intensify their efforts to force children from low-income backgrounds to mimic the cognitive process of the white middle-class.

The Futility of Liberal Reforms

After a decade of "innovation," liberal policy makers were forced to confront the results of their efforts. Needless to say, the statistical data generated by their well financed and well publicized studies failed to confirm the success of their efforts. In fact, the data destroyed even the assumption upon which those efforts were based. While the massive statistical labors embodied in the efforts of the Harvard Center for Educational Policy study and encapsulated in Jencks's Inequality is fraught with odd twists of logic and questionable statistical samples, the volume represents the best compilation of currently available data on the relationship of schooling to socio-economic status. This work is confirmed by more solidly grounded statistical correlations which result from the work of Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, particularly their study "I. Q. and the United States Class Structure."

In Inequality the Harvard consortium moved well beyond the Coleman position that school-related variables showed no relation to achievement if the

social environment of the school was held constant.[19] Thus, even if one could achieve the mythic equal distribution of resources in education, or if one of the myriad of current reforms were implemented in the fashion desired by its supporters, there would be little chance of delivering on the fraudulent promises made by the reformers to the poor.

Similarly, as discussed by Bowles and Gintis, there is little relation between the intelligence of a person as measured by the culture through the vehicles of the Standard Binet instrument, and his success. Drawing from many sources of data, they predict that

> being in the top decline in I.Q. renders a white male 3.09 as likely to be in the top economic success decline, and 0.6 likely to end in the bottom, as would be predicted by chance. Being in the top decline of school 3.75 as likely as .01 as likely while the corresponding ratio for social background is 3.26 and 0.4.[20]

By performing a regression analysis they conclude that while all three factors contributed, given a fix level of social class background and schooling, I.Q. adds little to the ability to predict eventual economic success. Moving further, they conclude that, "even were all social class differences eliminated, a similar pattern of social class intergenerational immobility would result."[21]

Thus, according to the best data available, neither the quality of schooling received by a child (Jencks), nor his conventionally measured intelligence (Bowles and Gintis) have significant predictive value on ultimate life income and occupation. Hopefully, this negative correlation should help to destroy the liberal myth that educational reform can, in and of itself, lead to societal

reform and randomized income distribution among children from identifiable racial and class backgrounds. Clearly, the basic causal assumptions which provided the basis for the reform movement, have little empirical validity. Thus, if all the intervention variables were removed, educational reform, as it is currently practiced by the public school system, would have little effect on the fate of oppressed people. Echoing back to the proclamations of Horace Mann: education can not function under capitalism as the balance wheel of society.

The Characteristics of Liberal Reform

The five basic intervention strategies outlined above - desegregation, model subsystems, parallel systems, total system reform, and compensatory education - are united by several common characteristics:

1. The retention of the basic integrity of the public school system, i.e., its stratification, educational principles, etc.;
2. The reaffirmation of the essential right to rule politically and culturally by the white middle class;
3. The retention, if not increase, in the power of such vested interests as professional teacher organizations and textbook publishers;
4. The lack of specific accountability of the reformers to the objects of their experimentation - the poor; and the lack of general accountability to the public for results.

If these assertions constitute themes which unite the operation of liberal reform, there exists a parallel theme of commonality in the effect of such reforms. Each of these new efforts, accompanied by well orchestrated public relations efforts, was billed as yet another breakthrough in the attempt of the system to accommodate the demands of its divergent constituencies. Strangely enough, as one device, i.e., desegregation, was discredited, another gimmick, such as decentralization, was paraded before the public, particularly before poor people, as the newly discovered solution to educational and social inequity. While to describe the process does not inherently question the sincerity of the professionals involved, it should establish the framework to visualize two of the consequences of the cycle: (1) the ability of the system to maintain legitimacy by the perpetual rotation of educational reforms, and (2) the ability of the system to perpetually defeat or absorb the demands of its critics by manipulating them through the process of reform. By creating constantly the appearance that change was in fact occurring, the educational bureaucrats could hope to retain their public credibility and simultaneously blunt the efforts of their critics.

As discussed earlier, this credibility, or legitimacy, was based on the mythology of schooling perpetrated by the society in order to rationalize the distribution of goods. It was argued that schools could work to eliminate poverty by eliminating cognitive inequality, an argument that provided the basis for all five intervention strategies. Given the effects of these reform

efforts on the perpetuation of the public school system, and its negative ramifications on the efforts of oppressed people, one must examine the basic legitimacy of the causal relationship postulated in the liberal argument between cognitive achievement and life status.

Footnotes Chapter VI

[1]Christopher Jencks et al., Inequality: A reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, 1972), p. 7.

[2]James Coleman, "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Winter, 1968), p. 14.

[3]Mario D. Fantini, "Implementing Equal Educational Opportunity," Ibid., 160-175.

[4]Summary of article by David J. Armor, "The Evidence of Busing," The Public Interest, Summer, 1972.

[5]U. S. Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Issues in School Finance (Washingon, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 14.

[6]Ibid., 16.

[7]Jencks, 19.

[8]Jerome Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 42, No. 4 (November, 1972), p. 521.

[9]Ibid., 523-524.

[10]U. S. Senate, 6.

[11]Ibid., 50.

[12] Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, School Finance Project, "Title I Comparability: A Preliminary Evaluation," September, 1972, (Mimeographed) p. 9.

[13]Samuel F. Yette, The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America (New York: Medaillon, 1971), p. 50.

[14]Jerome T. Murphy, "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 41, No. 1 (February, 1971), p. 60.

[15]Stephen S. and Joan C. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," in Ibid., Vol. 40, No. 1 (Winter, 1970), p. 30.

[16]Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City (Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1963), p. 5.

[17]Baratz, 36.

[18]Ibid., 40.

[19]Jencks, 53.

[20]Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "I.Q. in the United States Class Structure," (mimeographed: Harvard University, July, 1972), p. 13.

[21]Ibid., 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armor, David J. "The Evidence on Busing." The Public Interest. (Summer 1972, 90-126.

Baratz, Stephen S. and Joan C. Baratz. "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism." Harvard Educational Review. 40:1 Winter, 1970, 29-50.

Baratz and Shuy (eds.). Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Berg, Ivar. Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. Boston: Beacon, 1971.

Board of Education of the City of New York, Office of School Buildings, Division of Maintenance and Operation, Bureau of Plant Operation. Estimated Costs of Vandalism, 1959-1972.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. "I.Q. in the United States Class Structure." Harvard University, July 1972. (Unpublished mimeograph).

Carlton, Frank Tracy. Economic Influences Upon Educational Progress in the United States, 1820-1850. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965. (Originally published in 1908 by the University of Wisconson.)

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.

Cohen, David K. and Marvin Lazerson. "Education and the Corporate Order," Socialist Revolution, 2:8,2 (March-April 1970), 47-72.

Cohen, Yehudi A. "The Shaping of Men's Minds: Adaptation to the Imperatives of Culture." In Anthropological Perspectives on Education, Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond and Fred O. Gearing (eds.). New York: Basic, 1971.

Coleman, James. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity." Harvard Educational Review, 38:1 (Winter, 1968).

Cloward, Richard A. and Frances Fox Piven. Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Random House, 1971.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Random House, 1964.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Collier-Macmillan, 1938.

Dreeben, Robert. "The Contribution of Schooling to the Learning of Norms." In Socialization and Schools. Harvard Educational Review, 1968.

Fantini, Mario and Gerald Weinstein. Making Urban Schools Work: Social Realities and the Urban School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Fantini, Mario D. "Implementing Equal Educational Opportunity." Harvard Educational Review, 38:1 (Winter, 1968), 160-175.

Friedenberg, Edger Z. Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence. New York: Random House, 1963.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Gardner, John W. Excellence. Can we be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Gintis, Herbert. "Education, Technology, and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity," American Economic Review, May 1971.

_____. "Toward a Political Economy of Education: A Radical Critique of Ivan Illich's Deschooling Society." Harvard Educational Review, 42:1, (February 1972), 70-96.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1963), 50-53.

Green, Thomas F. "Citizenship or Certification." In Anthropological Perspectives on Education, Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond and Fred O. Gearing (eds.). New York: Basic, 1971.

Greer, Colin. The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Griggs, et al. Petitioners v. Duke Power Company. United States Supreme Court, 91 S. Ct. 849 (1971).

Hernstein, Richard. "I.Q." The Atlantic Monthly (September 1971), 42-64.

Jencks, Christopher et al. Inequality: A reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jensen, Arthur. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, 39:1-123, (Winter, 1969).

Kagen, Jerome (ed.). "Personality and Learning Process." Creativity and Learning. Boston: Beacon, 1967.

Karabel, Jerome. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." Harvard Educational Review, 42:4 (November 1972), 521-562.

Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Koerner, James D. Who Controls American Education? A Guide for Laymen. Boston: Beacon, 1968.

Lasch, Christopher. The New Radicalism in America: The Intellectual as a Social Type. New York: Random House, 1965.

Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, School Finance Project. "Title I Comparability: A Preliminary Evaluation." September 1972 (mimeographed).

Leacock, Eleanor Burke. Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Marcuse, Herbert. Negations. Boston: Beacon, 1968.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich, Engels. The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers, 1947.

McClelland, David C. (ed.). Talent and Society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Middletown, John (ed.). From Child to Adult: Studies in the Anthropology of Education. Garden City: The Natural History Press, 1970.

Mosteller, Frederick and Daniel P. Moynihan (eds.). On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Murphy, Jerome T. "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform." Harvard Educational Review, 41:1 (February 1971).

Newman, Fred M. and Oliver. "Education and Community." In Community and the Schools. Harvard Educational Review. Reprint, 1969.

Parsons, Talcott. "The School Class as a Social System." in Socialization and Schools. Harvard Educational Review, 1968.

Piaget, Jean. Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child. New York: Orion Press, 1970.

_____. The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Rist, Raymond C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review. 40:3: 4110451, August 1970.

Schlessinger, Arthur M. Jr. The Age of Jackson. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1945.

Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, United States Senate. Issues in School Finance. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. Education and Income: Inequalities in our Public Schools. New York: Viking, 1961.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1970.

Spring, Joel H. "Education and the Rise of the Corporate State." Socialist Revolution. 8:2 (March-April 1972) 72-103.

Strodtbeck, Fred L. "Family Interaction, Values, and Achievement." In Talent and Society. David C. McClelland (ed.). Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Vassar, Rena L. (ed.). Social History of American Education. Vol. I: Colonial Times to 1860. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Ware, Norman. The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860: The Reaction of American Industrial Society to the Advance of the Industrial Revolution. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1924.

Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond, Fred O. Gearing (eds.). Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic, 1971.

Welter, Rush. Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Wilson, Thomasyne Lightfoote. "Notes Toward a Process of Afro-American Education." Harvard Educational Review, 42:3 (August 1972), 374-389.

Yette, Samuel F. The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America. New York: Medaillon, 1971.